

Also, resolution of San Diego County Farm Bureau, in favor of national rural credits system and national marketing and information system; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of officers of Coast Artillery Corps, National Guard of California, for passage of militia pay bill; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LAFEAN: Memorial of Traffic Club of Erie, relative to compensation for common carriers; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. McDERMOTT: Petition of Chicago Federation of Musicians, favoring the creation of a nonpartisan tariff commission; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of John O'Brian and E. O. Kowalski, of Chicago, Ill., protesting any increase of the tax on beer; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McGILLICUDDY: Petition of Wilton Woolen Co., of Wilton, Me., in favor of House bill 702; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MANN: Papers accompanying House bill 8573, for relief of the estate of John C. Phillips; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MORIN (by request): Memorial of Stockton (Cal.) Chamber of Commerce, relative to railway mail pay; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, memorial of Major McKinley Council, No. 9, Pittsburgh, Pa.; and Sons and Daughters of Liberty, favoring passage of Burnett immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of attorney general, Harrisburg, Pa., relative to appointment of clerks of the courts of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Hartje Paper Manufacturing Co., favoring tax on dyestuff; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Charles M. Fairman, of Pittsburgh, Pa., favoring preparedness; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania: Petition of Frederick W. Shaefer, Frank Davis, Nick Billinger, and others, of Philadelphia, favoring embargo on arms, etc.; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MILLER of Delaware: Memorial of Pomona Grange, No. 1, Patrons of Husbandry, of Stanton, Del., relative to the spread of the foot-and-mouth disease; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. NEELY: Papers filed in support of bill for the relief of George W. Dawson; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. PRATT: Petition of Mr. A. Hohl, of Slaterville Springs, N. Y., favoring an embargo on further shipments of war materials; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of F. W. Ross, Thomas Wrigley, Carl N. Marshall, Robert H. Pearce, Joseph V. Foley, Robert N. Dixon, F. E. Kingsbury, Karl W. Fisher, Walter P. Ross, Edward L. Roe, Matthew O'Brien, Vincent Spraker, George V. Ganung, Harry J. Cooklin, Edward G. Wallace, Thomas Leary, C. E. Swayze, A. J. Mosher, J. E. Murphy, Joseph Ranielewicz, Charles S. Miller, Joseph McInerney, Harry B. Hazen, John F. Malone, P. E. Dixon, Albert D. Miller, Harry Baltz, George B. Williams, R. J. Benedict, D. L. O'Neil, Thomas McCarthy, Jacob Golos, Henry Kane, Ed. Havens, Asher Golos, and Edward Gaus, all employees of the Elmira Herald, of Elmira, N. Y., in favor of adequate national protection as advocated by either President Wilson or the National Security League and other organizations, and also in favor of training in the public schools as an essential for military preparedness; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PRICE: Petitions of sundry citizens of Talbott County, Md., asking for appropriation for dredging and opening of the harbor at Black Walnut Point at mouth of Great Choptank River; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. SANFORD: Petition of sundry citizens of Albany, N. Y., favoring passage of the Smith-Hughes bill for a Federal motion-picture commission; to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. SCULLY: Petition of Charles Mount & Co., Mr. Crawford, Mr. Burke, and D. V. Perrine, of Freehold, N. J., favoring passage of the Stevens-Ayres bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SNYDER: Petitions of Utica Steam and Mohawk Valley Cotton Mills and others, of Oneida Valley; Little Falls (N. Y.) Fiber Co.; New York Mills, and New York Bleachery, favoring tax on dyestuff; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STEELE of Pennsylvania: Petition of Pocono Hosiery Mills, of East Stroudsburg, Pa., favoring tax on dyestuffs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STINESS: Petition of Westerly (R. I.) Textile Co., favoring tax on dyestuffs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TEMPLE: Petition of citizens of Hickory City, Pa., favoring amendment abolishing polygamy in the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMAS: Memorial of Local No. 1862, United Mine Workers of America, against preparedness and conscription; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of Local No. 1862, United Mine Workers of America, favoring the printing of the report of the Commission on Industrial Relations; to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. TILSON: Petition of Dr. Max Mailhouse, president of the Connecticut State Medical Society, and others, for the expansion of the Medical Corps of the United States Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. VARE: Petition of Roosevelt Worsted Mills, favoring tax on dyestuffs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE.

THURSDAY, January 27, 1916.

The Chaplain, Rev. Forrest J. Prettyman, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, we come reverently before Thee that we may give prayerful attention to the problems that confront us in our national life. We know that beyond the measure of our minds there are great issues that do not yield their answer to the intellect alone, but lie back in the region of divine revelation. We come to seek Thy grace that we may address ourselves to the tasks that pertain to the welfare of this Nation in the spirit of the Christ, with a spirit of devotion and self-sacrifice and of piety and of brotherly love. Guide us in the discharge of these sacred duties this day. We ask for Christ's sake. Amen.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

PROPOSED EMBARGO ON MUNITIONS OF WAR.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, I present a petition, signed by 1,000,000 citizens of the United States, against the exportation from this country of munitions of war. The petition, now separated into a thousand parts, is in front of the Secretary's desk; and while the subject matter of the petition is not unusual, being a petition to Congress to place an embargo on the shipment of ammunition and war utensils, yet the size of the petition is something unusual, and I should like to take two or three moments, and two or three other Senators will take two or three moments, if there is no objection. Of course we realize that objection could be made, but we very earnestly hope it will not.

I ask that the heading of the petition may be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it will be so ordered.

The heading to the petition is as follows:

ORGANIZATION OF AMERICAN WOMEN FOR STRICT NEUTRALITY,
Baltimore, Md.

To the President and the Congress of the United States:

We, the undersigned, citizens of the United States, men and women, unite in earnest protest, for humanitarian reasons, against the exportation from this country of "the things which kill" for the use of nations engaged in the present conflict. While this sale of arms may be legal, it is morally wrong, and an embargo on arms is certainly legal and morally right. We base our protest on international law and precedent, as follows: Woolsey International Law: "If the neutral, instead of wheat, should send powder or balls, cannon or rifles, this would be a direct encouragement of the war, and so a departure from the neutral position."

President Taft in 1912 issued a proclamation forbidding the export of arms and munitions to Mexico.

In 1913 President Wilson, continuing the policy of President Taft, said that an embargo on arms "follows the best practice of nations in the matter of neutrality."

On April 23, 1898, after the Spanish-American War had begun, the British Government placed an embargo on munitions of war. The British Government also has a law on its statute books conferring discretionary power on the King of England to forbid the export of arms and ammunition.

Germany did not permit her citizens to sell arms or munitions of war to Spain during our war with that nation.

Besides all this we have President Wilson's own declaration of neutrality: "We must be neutral in fact as well as in name, and we must put a curb on every transaction which might give a preference to one party in the struggle over another."

Your signature will help stop this war.

Mr. KENYON. This petition, Mr. President, is presented by a band of women who are denominated "Organization of American Women for Strict Neutrality." The petition is signed by over a million people, reaching into every State in this Union, and if joined together in its various parts it would reach some 15½ miles.

There is no desire on the part of these women to irritate in any way the present conditions; to do any unpatriotic act or to in any way do anything sensational. The signers of this petition from every State in the Union are not pro-British or pro-German; they are pro-American, pro-humanity, and pro-Christianity; they are actuated only by the highest humanitarian motives.

The tremendous manufacture and shipment of things to kill people with is, however, prompted by no patriotic motive. It is not done merely because international law may permit it. It is a cold-blooded, money-making proposition for gain, profit, dividends. "Thou shalt not kill" is recognized as good morals as well as divine law, to which may well be added, "Thou shalt not assist others to kill."

Let us not deceive ourselves or hug to our bosom any delusion as to the prosperity coming to us from profits arising from helping to slaughter men, to widow women, and to orphan children. The jingle of the bloody dollar can not drown the sound of the groans and cries of misery arising from the battle fields of Europe. International law may permit it; moral law condemns it.

On October 4, 1914, the religious people of the United States, at the suggestion of the President, assembled and prayed for peace. Mr. President, to pray for peace on Sunday and to permit the balance of the week to be spent manufacturing and selling instrumentalities to prevent peace is rank hypocrisy.

The signers of this petition believe it is bad to continue these shipments, bad because it is inhuman, and this petition represents their dignified, solemn protest against the practice. Likewise it represents the toil, labor, heart throbs, and hopes of a noble band of women, who abhor war and pray that it may soon cease.

Mr. CLAPP. Mr. President, at a later period I expect to speak at some length upon this subject. I merely wish to say at this time that I believe sooner or later the awakened conscience of our Christian Nation will sweep aside the sophistries that have been invoked to support the inconsistent and incongruous spectacle of loading one ship with food and clothing for widows and orphans and loading another ship with the instrumentalities with which to make more widows and orphans.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, I am very glad the Senator from Iowa [Mr. KENYON] has presented this enormous petition, signed by over a million people of the United States, praying for prohibition on the exportation of arms and ammunition.

Mr. President, before I sit down I shall move that this great petition, instead of being referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, to which were referred the bills to prohibit the exportation of arms and ammunition introduced by the Senator from California and myself, shall be referred to the Committee on Commerce.

I shall do this for two reasons: First, I think the original reference was probably a mistake, for the reason that this is not a foreign affair. This is purely a domestic question.

I also do it, Mr. President, because yesterday and to-day I have received several telegrams which indicate a condition throughout the West which should attract the attention of the Committee on Commerce. I desire to read some of those telegrams for the enlightenment of the Senate. The first one is from Byron, Nebr., and is addressed to me, and reads as follows:

BYRON, NEBR., January 25, 1916.

HON. GILBERT M. HITCHCOCK,
Washington, D. C.:

We are tied up here; can not move any grain car. Shortage situation desperate. Please work for an immediate embargo on shipments of war munitions, to remain in force until the accumulated grain is released.

BYRON FARMERS' ELEVATOR CO.,
By J. G. JAMES, Manager.

Another one is from Pleasanton, Nebr., also addressed to me, and reads as follows:

PLEASANTON, NEBR., January 25, 1916.

HON. G. M. HITCHCOCK,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

Please work in Congress for an immediate embargo on shipment of war munitions, embargo to remain in force until the accumulated grain is unloaded and released at the seaports. Shortage of grain cars in this territory is becoming alarming and getting worse. The condition of corn demands immediate movement.

D. PHILLIPS.

Another is from Potter, Nebr., and reads as follows:

POTTER, NEBR., January 25, 1916.

Senator HITCHCOCK,
Washington, D. C.:

Car shortage is very serious—tied up. Can you work in Congress for an immediate embargo on munitions of war, embargo to remain in force until accumulated grain is released? Situation desperate with us.

FARMERS' GRAIN & MILLING CO.

Another is from Farwell, Nebr., and reads as follows:

FARWELL, NEBR., January 26, 1916.

Senator HITCHCOCK,
Washington, D. C.:

Can not get grain cars here to move our wheat and soft corn because of the preference given to munitions of war in eastern ports. Situation getting worse daily. Kindly take up with Congress for embargo on munitions of war until we can get accumulated grain released.

FARMERS' COOPERATIVE GRAIN & SUPPLY CO.,
Per JOHN HOFSETH, Manager.

Mr. President, I call these to the attention of the Senate, and particularly to the attention of the Committee on Commerce, because they present a new issue. This manufacture of deadly arms and ammunition has become of such absorbing and controlling interest in the East as to require new factories for the manufacture of these munitions and the enlargement of the old factories upon such scale that the industry is becoming the chief business in the eastern part of the United States to-day; and the arms and ammunition being thus manufactured for their deadly work in Europe absorb the cargo space of our ocean-going vessels that ought to be given to the legitimate business of the United States.

If the appeals to the sentiment of the country, to the moral sense of the country, to the religious sense of the country, are not sufficient in this body to arouse a responding action, if they are not sufficient in this body to command the attention of Senators, perhaps they will listen to the cry that is coming up from the West, where legitimate business is being paralyzed by the absorption of the ocean-carrying vessels of the country in this damnable trade in arms and ammunition.

Shall this country be converted into a great arsenal and shall our legitimate business be paralyzed in the West in order that millionaires may be made in the East, that munition stock may be doubled and trebled and quadrupled in value by men who are bringing upon this country a heritage of hate abroad, by men who are bringing on this country a sense of contempt abroad even by the nations that are benefited by this trade? It is now fashionable in those nations to proclaim that the Yankees, as long as they are making money out of this damnable commerce, will submit to any interference with their neutral rights.

Mr. President, I say this is not a matter of foreign affairs for the Committee on Foreign Relations. It is a matter of domestic concern, not only because of the legitimate interests which are imperiled but it is a matter of domestic concern because it is no business of any country in Europe, of any belligerent in Europe, whether we place an embargo upon the exportation of arms and ammunition or whether we do not. We can be neutral and permit this outrageous trade under international law, there is no doubt of that, but we can also be neutral and prohibit it.

No country has a right to demand that we prohibit it. No country has that right, neither has any country the right to deny to us the privilege of prohibiting it. It is purely a domestic question, and it is an American question, Mr. President, which involves not only our legitimate business interests, which involves not only our moral conscience and our religious sense, but it is a domestic question because it involves the integrity and solidarity of our population. Shall we permit this damnable trade to go on and breed hate at home among the great foreign-born population that is in our midst? Shall we permit this trade to go on and to continue to stimulate this feeling of hate not only abroad but at home among the millions of citizens who are a part of us? Whether those citizens are English born or Swedish born or Danish born or Irish born or German born or Bohemian born or Polish born, it is not within the limits of human nature for them to behold the great resources of our country dedicated to the manufacture of deadly weapons to be sent abroad to kill their relatives in the Old World without being filled with indignation and hate. When they see that these great banking and industrial resources of America are used for that purpose, it is natural for them to resent it, and thus breed in this country a dangerous race hatred. If it continues long, it will tend to produce in our population a disintegration into the races which ought to be amalgamated into the great new American race.

So, Mr. President, I say that this is a domestic or American question, one involving our welfare, involving the solidarity of our people, and I hope it will be considered without regard to its effect on Europe.

I am a neutral, Mr. President. I do not want to see either side in this war crush the other side. I am against having either of them victorious. I am for America.

I move that the petition be referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, I wish to suggest to the Senator whether perhaps the situation as to the movement of grain might not be entirely relieved if favorable action were taken on this petition at present, the circumstances being that two-thirds at least of our shipping is controlled to-day by foreign nations. We have less than 2,000,000 tons under the American flag. The rest of the tonnage necessary to move the commerce between the United States and foreign countries is entirely controlled by those countries. So it is a question of very serious moment in connection with the movement of corn and other grain as to whether or not we are ever going to provide for an American merchant marine which can move our commerce to foreign ports.

Mr. STONE and Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Missouri.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, it is not my purpose to enter into this discussion. I do not think it a proper time for that. I was advised by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. KENYON] that he wished to address the Senate for two or three minutes in presenting these petitions, and that one or two other Senators would like to occupy about the same length of time; but the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK] has made an extended speech on the general subject of embargo, and the Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER] followed with a speech relating to the shipping bill. Heaven only knows where or to what length this discussion will run if it continues without interruption.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. STONE. I hope the discussion will not be further persisted in, and I make the point of order that debate is not in order on a mere question of referring a petition. I ask whether the Chair thinks such a question is debatable?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair is of the opinion that the motion of the Senator from Nebraska is in order and is debatable.

Mr. STONE. Then in that view the debate can proceed on that motion.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair has been examining the rules, and does not find that this is one of the questions that are to be settled without debate, it being a question for the Senate to determine whether these petitions should go to the Committee on Foreign Relations, to which the Chair would have felt compelled to send them if there had been no question raised; but it is the right of the Senator from Nebraska to move to send them to any other committee, and that question is debatable.

Mr. STONE. Undoubtedly the Chair would have referred the petitions to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as the bills to which they relate have already been referred to that committee. It would be an odd proceeding to send a bill to one committee to-day and on to-morrow send petitions relating to the bill to a different committee. Either the whole matter should remain with the Committee on Foreign Relations or the Committee on Foreign Relations should be discharged from the consideration of the subject and the whole matter be referred to another committee.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri permit me to interrupt him for a minute?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Virginia?

Mr. STONE. Yes.

Mr. SWANSON. I wish to call the attention of the Chair to section 5 of Rule VII.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President—

Mr. SWANSON. I understand this is simply a question as to the reference of a petition, and I understand that under section 5 of Rule VII all petitions shall be presented and referred without debate. This is not a motion to refer a bill. The rule directs how petitions shall be received and referred; it seems to me it states clearly that petitions shall be received and referred without debate.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President, I rise to a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. SWANSON. I will read what the rule says, if the Chair desires me to do so. It provides:

5. Every petition or memorial shall be signed by the petitioner or memorialist and have indorsed thereon a brief statement of its contents, and shall be presented and referred without debate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If the Senator from Virginia will read section 4 of Rule VII he will observe this language:

4. Every petition or memorial shall be referred, without putting the question, unless objection to such reference is made; in which case all

motions for the reception or reference of such petition, memorial, or other paper shall be put in the order in which the same shall be made, and shall not be open to amendment, except to add instructions.

The rules sometimes seemingly conflict.

Mr. SWANSON. If the Chair will permit me to make a suggestion, that means that the Senator from Missouri [Mr. STONE] can not move to amend the motion for reference by inserting the Committee on Foreign Relations for the Committee on Commerce, but the question of debate is settled definitely by section 5, which says such papers shall be "referred without debate."

I do not see any conflict, if the Chair will permit me, between the two sections. The rule simply says that the motions shall be put in the order in which they are made. The Senator from Nebraska first made the motion, and that takes precedence of any motion for reference to another committee, and can not be amended by motion to refer to another committee; but section 5 distinctly states that petitions shall be presented and referred without debate. It seems that section 4 simply provides the order in which those different motions for reference must be made, voted on, and determined.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair is quite likely to be wrong, but the Chair is clearly of the opinion that this is what all the rules of the Senate mean when construed together, that it is not proper to discuss a petition or memorial presented to the Senate of the United States; and the Chair assumes that that is the reason why the Senator from Iowa spoke to the Senator from Missouri about the matter, in order that there should be no objection to the discussion on the memorials or petitions which have been presented. The Chair has no doubt at all that under the ordinary procedure of the Senate of the United States petitions and memorials are not to be discussed, but are to be referred without debate; when, however, any Senator takes issue with the Chair, or, without taking issue with the Chair, desires a petition or memorial to be referred to a certain committee, then the Chair believes that the Senator has a right to move to refer it to a certain committee, and that that question is debatable—not the merits of the petition but the question as to where the petition shall go—but, of course, from that decision of the Chair the Senator has the privilege of appeal.

Mr. STONE. I should like the Chair to submit that question to the Senate.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President, I rise to a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Connecticut will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I did not hear the last part of the rule which the Chair read. Was it to the effect that the motion to refer to a committee was not amendable?

The VICE PRESIDENT. No.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I could not hear the rule as read by the Chair, but that was the impression I got as the Chair read the rule.

The VICE PRESIDENT. This rule provides:

Every petition or memorial shall be referred, without putting the question—

And without debate, as the Chair understands, under section 5 of the rule—

unless objection to such reference is made, in which case all motions for the reception or reference of such petition, memorial, or other paper shall be put in the order in which the same shall be made, and shall not be open to amendment, except to add instructions.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Now, then, my parliamentary inquiry is, Is not the motion of the Senator from Nebraska to send these petitions to the Committee on Commerce amendable by moving to send them to some other committee, and would not the amendment be debatable, as well as the original motion?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Just a moment.

Mr. STONE. I should like to say while the Chair—

Mr. BRANDEGEE. In other words, what is in my mind is this: If a Senator introduces a petition and moves its reference to a particular committee, if it is not within the power of the Senate to amend the motion by substituting some other committee, then the only method of procedure open to the Senate is to vote that motion down if they disagree to the reference and then move to send it to another committee. I think the custom is—I have repeatedly seen it done—that a Senator moves to substitute another committee than the one suggested by the Senator who makes the motion.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, may I make an appeal to the Senator from Missouri? We would have been through with this matter by this time if it had not been for this interruption. Will not the Senator wait and let the few speeches that are to be made be concluded? They will all be very brief, and will not take, I think, more than 15 or 20 minutes.

Mr. STONE. That was the assurance the Senator gave me in the first instance.

Mr. KENYON. And that assurance was carried out.

Mr. STONE. The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK] was not very brief, and the Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER] did not discuss this subject at all. Can the Senator assure me that there is no Senator here present who will occupy more than one or two minutes and that the discussion will be confined to this petition? Of course, the Senator can not do that.

Mr. KENYON. That would be a preposterous thing to assume about the Senate.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from New Jersey?

Mr. STONE. Yes.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. If the Senator from Missouri will yield to me for a moment, I will say that I do not desire to take the time or to interfere with the business of the Senate; but I feel that this is a subject of the greatest importance to the American people, and I should like to express my feelings in a very few words, with the permission of the Senate.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, the Senator knows I would yield to any request of his as quickly as to that of anyone, but I desire to have this matter ended now, if it can be ended. I object to any implied, much less express, unanimous consent. No express unanimous consent was asked and none given.

Mr. President, speaking to the point of order, if the ruling of the Chair is correct, it would leave the Senate in a somewhat helpless condition. Any Senator wishing to delay the proceedings of the Senate could offer a petition and a motion then be made to refer it; and if the matter is then open to debate, every Senator here would have the right to debate it.

Mr. OVERMAN. And take up the morning hour.

Mr. STONE. Not only one morning hour, but the morning hours for a week or a month in debating the motion to refer. If that is the rule, it ought not to be; and, with a view to testing the sense of the Senate, I think I will appeal from the ruling of the Chair, unless the Chair will voluntarily submit the question to the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is, Shall the ruling of the Chair stand as the judgment of the Senate?

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. Mr. President, I think, under the ruling of the Chair, it is a debatable motion, and an appeal from the decision of the Chair on a debatable proposition is itself subject to debate. I would not care to occupy much of the time of the Senate; but I think the Chair is right.

Of course, many of our rules may be condemned by pointing out the fact that they are susceptible of abuse when any considerable group of Senators see proper to practice that form of abuse known as unlimited debate. That particular question has been repeatedly considered by the Senate, and after a hundred years of resistance the other side of it has appeared to be the stronger.

I think the whole purpose of our proceedings here is to afford a clear opportunity to put the Senate in possession of the reasons why a certain thing should be done or the reasons why it should not be done. There may be exceptional reasons in this case. Ordinarily matters of this kind can be disposed of by the Chair. In nine hundred and ninety-nine cases out of a thousand they are disposed of by the Chair and by the clerks at the desk. It occasionally comes about that there is a necessity for saying something about a particular proposition; but I think the common sense and fairness of the Senate can be relied upon to put a necessary limitation on the occasion. I therefore think that the ruling announced by the Chair is founded on the reason of the case and harmonizes perfectly with the general scope of proceedings here.

Now, take this particular case. Ordinarily it would be a matter of indifference as to what particular committee a number of petitions on any subject should go. It is almost the constant practice here to pay no particular attention to petitions, but this particular case takes a significance at this time that it would not take at another time. I believe that there should have been an embargo laid upon the export of arms. I believe this country, in its greatness, should have set the world the example of refusing to be a party, directly or indirectly, for commercial or any other reasons, to the slaughter of human beings that is going on in the Old World. I believe that the enlightened conscience of the age would have justified it, and that such action would have added one more reason why this should be regarded as the greatest Government that ever was instituted among men. I do not believe that we did our duty when we fell in behind the ancient precedents, made at a time when slaughter was the rule; that we did not concrete into our action the enlightened spirit of the Christian humanity that exists to-day,

and which we preach theoretically but which we fail to enforce practically.

Many insist that to do so now would be a breach of neutrality; the question loses its character of one where the proposition is to lay an embargo or not, and the question of neutrality is injected into it. Nations have been forced to rely upon it; they say they have; and they have built their foreign policies and other relations to us on the theory of our past practice, and now to undertake to stop it as a mere commercial question at home would not meet the question in its ultimate boundaries.

I think the petition should go to the Committee on Foreign Relations. It has now become a vital question of international policy. It may be too late to take definite action such as we ought to take—if it is ever too late to do right—and it may not be; but in the confidence of that committee, in my opinion, would be the best place to consider it in its present aspect, and I think those of us who feel that way about it ought to have an opportunity to say that.

The Committee on Commerce is a strictly commercial committee. It deals with the commercial aspect of the shipping question, most particularly with reference to that part of the shipping function that takes place on the waters. There is another committee of the Senate that deals with it in the aspect which relates to the railroads, but now time and circumstances, past practices, contentions upon the one hand, and denials upon the other, have made another question out of it. It is a matter, in my opinion, peculiarly fit for decision by the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. Mr. President, I feel very much in sympathy with the suggestions advanced by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. CLARKE]. I feel that this is a peculiar and remarkable situation; and for myself I want to take this opportunity to express my feelings a little on this subject, and I feel very deeply about it.

My father came from France; my good mother came from Germany; so you may wonder what my sympathies may be in this hellish war and controversy in Europe. I will say that my heart bleeds for Europe and its people. Do you ask me my sympathies? My sympathies are with humanity, wherever they may be found and wherever they may go.

I care not whom this matter of embargo may benefit. That is a question as foreign to me as the pole. The question with me is as to the justice, the humanitarian side, and the right of the proposition. I will not aid my brother in the slaughter of his fellow man. The business side of the proposition that has been advanced here has no appeal to me. Money is valuable, but, great God, better and above all that is the love for humanity!

I feel, Mr. President, that a greater danger will come to this blessed land from the money changers in our land than from any force of arms that can be arrayed against it. I am thankful, indeed, that the petition has been brought in here, and I trust that it may be potent with the governing power of this country toward staying the shipment of arms to further bring blood and sorrow to the soil of Europe.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, I do not always agree with the distinguished Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK]; but he has spoken eminently to my satisfaction this morning.

It might be proper for me to recall that in the Sixty-third Congress, during the third session thereof, the distinguished Senator who contributes such credit to this Chamber and such usefulness to his own State, Mr. HITCHCOCK, introduced to an appropriation bill an amendment laying an embargo upon the shipment of arms to the belligerents of Europe.

I took pleasure in voting for his amendment; and I embrace this opportunity to express my belief that the 1,000,000 signatures of persons who have seen fit to exercise their constitutional prerogative and send their petition here could be multiplied fifty or sixty times, because of the feeling throughout the Nation that we are not guiltless before the moral law when for mere "profits" we send arms to the belligerents that they may grind up more human flesh to be buried nameless in a trench. We can not simply stand off, point to the width of our phylacteries, and say we are wholly guiltless while we take blood-money profits from the warring powers.

Mr. President, I am not so simple as to pretend that I believe it is contrary to international law to send arms and munitions to the warring powers. Of course, it is according to international law to ship arms to warring nations. It is also according to the "profits." We have heard of "the law and the prophets." It is the "profits," however, rather than "law" that move these munition makers to reap and glean in such a doubtful field.

The Senator spoke of "Yankees." What is the sentiment of the Yankees on this subject? When guns made by foreign

powers were aimed at their breasts, their statesmen, warriors, poets, orators, writers, and lecturers objected to the shipment of arms to their antagonists; and that great writer in a little couplet—I believe it will be found in the Bigelow Papers—said:

You wonder why we're hot, John?
Your mark was on the guns—
On the guns that shot, John,
Our brothers and our sons.

So, Mr. President, if there be to-day one influence in our country more baleful than another it is that the continued shipment of arms and ammunition to the warring nations is causing the suggestion that the United States is a country seeking only profit and not seeking wholly to do justice to humanity.

When the eternal verities of the world are finally presented and the living thunders of eternal truth clear the atmosphere, it ought to be the destiny of our advanced, our American, civilization to take an exalted position in the tribunal which will compose these world-wide differences. What will be our position when the day of reckoning comes? When the immortal roll of the nations of the earth is called to make up a peace tribunal, what nation is there more able, more worthy than the United States to take its place and stand at the head of the supreme court of arbiters which will settle that unhappy conflict which is dislocating all the currents of the world? How compromising will be our position in that great tribunal if our hands be even indirectly stained with human blood. Will it not be inferred that we are biased or prejudiced when it is remembered that we encouraged the warring powers by the shipment to them of arms and ammunition? Our country should be the nation set upon a hill whose light should shine and encourage all. It should be the one nation above all ready to set an example to the others, and when peace finally comes our Nation should enter the great Sanhedrim of nations—the great Sanhedrim of the world—stainless and pure, able truthfully to look all the other nations in face and say, "We have not contributed in any way to the perpetuation or the prolongation of your gigantic strife." Let us enter that great court with clean hands. The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. GORE] says, sotto voce, "shake not thy gory locks at me."

Let us hope, Mr. President, when the day of reckoning comes we can truthfully say to the other powers:

Thou canst not say I did it; never shake
Thy gory locks at me.

Hard feelings, resentments, and enmities which I fear will endure longer than the life of any person in this Chamber, including the pages who serve us here, are being created, and will smolder from this traffic in arms and munitions carried on at this time. These shipments of arms and ammunition, owing to the great profits which are arising from them, breed the war spirit in our country, and are causing many honest people to believe that we should turn our country into an armed military camp.

The baleful influence of this traffic of such doubtful propriety does not stop there, however. For more than 20 years the distinguished Senator from South Carolina [Mr. TILMAN] has labored to secure the erection of a factory for the purpose of permitting the Government to manufacture its own armor plate, its own munitions, arms, and its own powder, in order that the extortionate profits taken by the manufacturers may be somewhat curtailed. But with all his eminence as a statesman, with his continual work of 20 years he has made little progress. And to-day I doubt very much if he will be able to bring in a bill providing for the construction of a Government-owned armor-plate factory and a factory for making our own arms and munitions.

What has caused this country for 20 years to be deprived of an armor-plate factory and a factory for the manufacture of its own munitions? Profits, not law; profits in order that certain men may reach out and gather in not only 50 per cent but 500 per cent.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, I rise to address myself to the rule. Of course I always dislike to differ with the Chair.

The rules fix a morning hour. What is the morning hour for? The introduction of petitions; to allow the committees to make reports; to allow concurrent and joint resolutions to be introduced. And you see all through this rule, Rule VII, that debate is prohibited.

Now, a large part of the morning hour has been taken up with debate on this matter. I am making no objection to the merits of what has been done this morning; but as to the rule, it seems to me that if the Chair is right any Senator or a small number of Senators can absolutely take up the morning hour, and deprive us of introducing our petitions, our bills, and our reports of committees.

Reading along in this rule, it says:

Until the morning business shall have been concluded, and so announced from the Chair, or until the hour of 1 o'clock has arrived, no motion to proceed to the consideration of any bill, resolution, report of a committee, or other subject upon the calendar shall be entertained.

And so, Mr. President, in every section there is a limitation upon motions or a limitation upon debate; showing that the Senate intended, when it made this rule, that there should be an hour during which Senators could present the reports of committees and introduce their bills.

Therefore, while I hate to differ with the Chair, I think the Chair is wrong.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, with what has been said by the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. CLARKE], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK], and the Senator from Arizona [Mr. ASHURST] I am in sympathy. Nevertheless, I believe that if this subject is to be discussed now it should be pointed out that heretofore the United States never has adopted the policy of manufacturing for itself a sufficient supply of munitions of war to provide it in case this Government should become engaged in conflict.

During all the wars in which we have been engaged the United States has been compelled to purchase abroad much of the munitions which we have used in war. While it is true that as a result of the increase in this trade we are now manufacturing in the United States greater quantities of munitions than ever before in the history of the country, it is also true that at this time we are not equipped with sufficient machinery and factories to supply the demands of the United States in case she should become involved in war.

I hope, sir, that the day will never dawn when this country will be called upon to enter into another serious conflict. I belong to that class of citizens who believe that the time is approaching when men will find some means of settling their disputes, however bitter they may be, without resorting to war; and yet I realize that force is still the most powerful factor in the arbitrament of the important questions that arise before the peoples of the world. The time has not yet come when we can expect to continue at peace without the possibility, at least, of becoming engaged in war.

I merely want to suggest to the Senate that in considering the matter of placing an embargo on arms and munitions of war we should bear in mind the necessities of the United States itself, and not too quickly commit this Government to a policy which would deny her the means of self-defense in case we should become involved in a war with a foreign power. For if we assert as a doctrine of humanity, or as a doctrine of international law, that a neutral nation can not sell arms to a belligerent, then we must expect to have that doctrine invoked and applied against us in case we should find ourselves compelled to combat an aggressive enemy. Of course embargoes for retaliatory purposes rest upon a different basis. I do not discuss that now, but merely suggest that the safety of the United States may be involved in the question under present conditions and while we have no provision for manufacturing adequate munitions to meet the requirements of this Government in case of war.

Mr. WORKS. Mr. President, I am in very hearty sympathy with the objects and purposes of the good women of the country who have brought this petition before the Senate.

From the very beginning I have been opposed to the exportation of arms and munitions of war. Early in the last session of Congress I introduced a bill to place an embargo upon the trade, not in the interest of any foreign nation but in the interest of our own country. I believe the trade to be immoral and demoralizing to the people of the United States. I believe that most of the complications that have grown up between this and foreign nations now at war have been the result of the trade in munitions of war. I believe that if it had not been for the fact that we were dealing in that nefarious trade the people upon the *Lusitania* would not have lost their lives.

We have, in effect, made our country a party to the war across the ocean. It is our ammunition, our shot and shell, that are taking the lives of the citizens and subjects of friendly nations in Europe. We can not justify ourselves in that position or in that trade by saying that it is allowed by the laws of neutrality. There is something higher that should control the people of the United States than the mere strict law of neutrality. The law of neutrality at most only permits the exportation of arms and places no obligation upon us to do so.

My convictions upon this subject were intensified when circumstances so came about that we could furnish arms only to one set of the belligerent nations as against the other. Then to my mind the trade ceased to be neutral; it ceased to be.

justified even by the permission of the laws of neutrality. But I have tried to put the question upon higher grounds than that. I insist that the trade is immoral; it is participating in the war across the ocean, and for that reason it ought to be stopped. Therefore, I am saying these few words in support of the petition that is now presented to the Senate.

Mr. LANE. Mr. President, I am now and at all times have been opposed to the exportation of munitions of war to the citizens of one country with which we are at peace to kill the citizens of another country with which we are at peace. I fear that sooner or later we, as a nation, will have to answer for it; that it will create deep-seated resentment and perhaps a hatred of us by the people of other nations—good people—who will find it hard to forgive us for the death of their brothers, their cousins, and their fathers and their sons who have been killed by missiles made in this country, propelled by powder made in this country. I have felt that no good—or, rather, nothing but harm—could come from it; that we had better do without the money which we make in that way. I would be willing to vote for an appropriation to ship to those who have suffered from the results of the war in Europe shiploads of baby shoes, of condensed and prepared milk upon which to feed the starving infants and clothing for the women who are suffering from want, and to convoy them with battleships, if necessary, to see that they reach their destination.

I believe that infinite harm will result in this country, in our own affairs, from the hatred that has been bred among our own people, which will last for generations. I have regretted, and I am sorry, that many people in business in this country have felt differently, and have felt that they were justified in entering in that kind of a trade. I am neutral as between the nations. If we could have kept entirely out of it, it would have been one of the greatest blessings not only for them but for us.

I am in sympathy with the petitioners, and I could not let the occasion pass without saying so.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President, I shall not detain the Senate long upon the direct issue before the Senate, which is the ruling of the Vice President.

The Vice President has held that a motion to refer a petition is debatable. I think that rule would be very disastrous to the business of the morning hour. I think it would be ruinous to have that rule adopted as a rule of the Senate. It seems to me that it is so plainly against the clear, specific provisions of Rule VII that I want to call the attention of the Senate to Rule VII, section 5.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. Mr. President, will the Senator from Virginia permit me to call his attention to a ruling made by the Chair on the 28th of March, 1914, in connection with the subject he is now discussing? It will save the trouble of bringing the matter to the attention of the Senate at a later time.

Mr. SWANSON. I will.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. On page 95 of the Precedents this appears:

The VICE PRESIDENT. In this connection the Chair desires to make a statement. The Chair was in error in ruling that the question of the reference of a bill to a committee is not debatable. The Chair was under the impression that the question was one of those questions which, under Rule XXII, are not debatable; but the Chair finds that the question is debatable. Therefore the ruling of the Chair heretofore made in reference to the matter will not stand as a precedent.

The ruling made by the Chair this morning is in exact accord with that ruling.

Mr. SWANSON. If the Senator will permit me, there is this difference. There is no motion here of a resolution or bill for reference. No resolution is on the table; none has been introduced. The specific question is whether petitions when presented, not a bill or a resolution, are debatable.

Mr. KENYON. That is not the question at all. The question is on a motion to refer.

Mr. SWANSON. Here are petitions presented. There is no resolution, no bill. A motion is made to refer those petitions. That is the issue. The question is whether a motion to refer a petition is debatable.

I will read section 5 of Rule VII, and I should like to hear the Senator from Arkansas explain it away. This is not a motion to refer a resolution or a bill. Here is the rule of the Senate governing petitions:

Every petition or memorial shall be signed by the petitioner or memorialist and have indorsed thereon a brief statement of its contents, and shall be presented and referred without debate.

Mr. KENYON. We are not debating the petition but the motion.

Mr. SWANSON. The rule says that a petition shall be referred without debate. You are attempting to reverse the rule that it shall be referred without debate.

Mr. KENYON. Of course, if there were no motion pending. Mr. SWANSON. It is laid down in the compilation here—

The presentation of petitions and memorials shall be determined without debate.

The Senator was correct in reference to a motion made to refer a resolution or a bill, but that is not the issue. The issue is when a petition is presented here in the morning hour, and a motion is made to refer it, whether we shall continuously debate it. Section 5 of Rule VII says that petitions shall be referred without debate. That is all we have asked in this case.

Before I conclude my remarks I wish to say a few words about the reference of the petition. Bills have gone to the Committee on Foreign Relations which appertain to the petition. Bills have heretofore been introduced covering this question, and they have been referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations. The question involved more than all else is whether the shipment is an act of neutrality, whether it is good faith with all the belligerents in this great war, and the Committee on Foreign Relations is to determine that question. It is to determine the effect of it. It is to determine whether it will embroil us in war or not. The Committee on Foreign Relations is empowered to consider our intricate foreign relations, and that is the proper committee to dispose of this petition.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Mr. President, I understand the question to be submitted to the Senate is whether or not this question is open to debate. Am I correct about that?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair rules that the motion of the Senator from Nebraska to refer the petitions to the Committee on Commerce is a debatable question. Upon that an appeal has been taken, and the pending question is, Shall the ruling of the Chair stand as the judgment of the Senate?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Mr. President, I think the ruling of the Chair is correct. I do not think this question presents a mere matter of reference of a petition which under the rule is to be disposed of without debate. We have gotten beyond that. The Senator from Nebraska has moved that the petitions be referred to a particular committee, and that question, it seems to me, very clearly is open to debate. Passing that, however, and coming to the question of the disposition of the motion, it seems to me very clearly that the petitions ought not to go to the Committee on Commerce, but that they should go to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

To what subject are these petitions directed? To the subject of an embargo. They ask the Congress of the United States to pass a law placing an embargo upon the shipment of certain goods to foreign countries. The proposed legislation, therefore, to which the petitions are directed clearly would be a class of legislation which would go to the Committee on Foreign Relations. The subject matter of an embargo comes under the general principles of international law. The Committee on Foreign Relations is constituted for the express purpose of dealing with such questions, and I am at a loss to understand upon what theory the proposed legislation itself should go to one committee and petitions requesting that that specific legislation shall be passed should go to an entirely different committee.

Obviously the petitions belong to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

But, independently of the rule and in support of the policy of the rule, it is peculiarly appropriate that these petitions should go to the Committee on Foreign Relations, because in the last analysis they deal with an exceedingly delicate question of our foreign relations, namely, the question of our neutrality. If Europe was not at war, if peace prevailed throughout the world, we might pass an act prohibiting for the future the transportation of munitions of war from our country to any other country without affecting the question of neutrality at all. But that is not the situation. A condition of war prevails in Europe. It is idle for us to pretend that the act of Congress with reference to this question will not have a very profound effect upon the warring nations in Europe.

I undertake to say if we should pass a law here prohibiting the shipment of munitions abroad it would be a very great aid to and very greatly strengthen the hands of one of the contending parties in the war.

In that state of the case it is proper that we should consider the question as to whether we would not, by complying with these petitions, be committing an unneutral act; and, that being so, it is clearly a question the Committee on Foreign Relations should consider and determine.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President, I realize the importance of the subject of these petitions. I understand the serious interest which all of the people feel, and I do not desire that

sympathy or impulsive sentiments should betray me into supporting a measure that mature judgment might find to be detrimental to our country. Yet, Mr. President, I can not see how the United States can in good conscience take any other position than the one proposed by the petitioners and so strongly advocated by the senior Senator from Nebraska. We have taken the position of neutrality; at least, we have attempted to take it. We have professed it from the beginning, and yet one of the belligerents to whom the great supply of arms is shipped has repeatedly changed and in some cases annulled the international law, since the war opened, as to our neutral rights. Those changes have been detrimental to the commerce of the United States, and our repeated polite and diplomatic protests have been ignored.

Therefore it seems to me that we could not be embarrassed, as suggested by the Senator from Utah [Mr. SUTHERLAND], if at this time we take action which certainly we had a right to do at the beginning of the war and which has been postponed too long already.

I voted at the first and only opportunity I have had to accomplish that end. I do not believe the status of international relations has been so changed as to preclude us now from doing the thing which I think most disinterested Americans would have recognized as the right thing to have done at the beginning.

Mr. President, I think it is generally believed that the United States has not been impartially neutral in reference to the European war. I think we are regarded at home and abroad as one of the allies, and all through the shipment of arms and munitions of war to them, while permitting, with only weak protest, the violation of American rights by Great Britain in a manner greatly detrimental to both the United States and the central powers.

I express no favorites among the belligerents. I have none. I am absolutely neutral in this respect. Our country should have none. That it does have I have no doubt. That it can not be truly neutral so long as it permits the shipment of war supplies to one of the belligerents which denies us the right to ship food material to another belligerent with which we are at peace is equally certain. I am in sympathy with these petitioners and with the million others who have not thus spoken to the Senate. I trust their prayer will not fall on deaf committee ears. I believe, however, that its proper reference is to the Committee on Foreign Relations. The subject matter to which these petitions refer is there. It is being considered, or at least should be considered, by that committee. I hope that committee will consider it and present it to the Senate for action at an early date. It is right to the Senate that this should be done. There should be a full and free discussion, and such can only be obtained through a committee report submitted to the Senate.

It seems to me that a reference to the Commerce Committee, where nothing pertinent to the subject is pending, would be wrong. The Committee on Foreign Relations has complete jurisdiction of the subject, and it should receive the request which a million people of the United States have asked of Congress. I am not suggesting precipitate action, but I am insisting that serious consideration be given to this all-important matter, to the end that the United States Congress take steps as American rights and duties require.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I do not rise to discuss the petition itself. I will state, however, that my sympathies have been that the Government of the United States being the great neutral country of the world should have undertaken, in the first place, to prohibit the exportation of munitions of war to belligerent countries. I was in favor of the embargo that was placed upon the exportation of munitions of war into Mexico by President Taft. I deplored the lifting by President Wilson of that embargo, as I told the President in person. The question of a prohibition at this late date will meet difficulties that would not have been met if a prohibition had been imposed at the beginning of the war, and might perhaps be very embarrassing for our country to enforce.

But, Mr. President, I rose to say a few words about the ruling of the Chair, because I fully agree with all that has been said by the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. OVERMAN] and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON]. I am not going over the ground again, but I want to call attention to the ruling of the present occupant of the chair. Under the head of morning business, page 173 of the Precedents, on June 21, 1913:

During the morning hour, Mr. NORRIS moved to refer a communication from the Attorney General to the Committee on the Judiciary. Mr. CLARK of Arkansas objected to debate.

The VICE PRESIDENT (Mr. Marshall). The Chair holds that during the morning hour the motion is not debatable. The Chair will state

for the information of the Senator from Nebraska that the Chair rules that the communication from the Attorney General can lie on the table, and the Senator from Nebraska can call it up at the proper time and proceed to discuss it.

Mr. NORRIS. In order to get the parliamentary situation settled for future reference, when it may be desirable to enforce this rule, if it is to be established, I want to inquire in the best of faith if a motion to refer a communication to a committee after the morning hour is debatable?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It is. (See CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, pp. 2117, 2118.)

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair has broadened his knowledge since then.

Mr. SMOOT. I think, Mr. President, the ruling of the Chair at that time was perfectly right. I am jealous of preserving the rights of the Senate in attending to its necessary business during the morning hour. If the present ruling stands, any morning can be consumed by a Senator moving to refer a petition that he is not interested in in the least and cares nothing about; and the whole of the morning hour could be taken up in the discussion of that motion.

It is for that reason, Mr. President, that I appeal to the Senate now to express itself upon this subject, knowing full well what it means for the future conduct of the business of this body.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, I have no intention now, as I stated when on the floor a short time since, to debate the merits of the question of placing an embargo on the shipment of arms and munitions of war or anything to any foreign country. I have some opinions upon that question, but I have not thought that this was the proper time or occasion for a debate upon the subject. There is nothing before the Senate of an affirmative character. The proposed legislation itself has been introduced and referred.

I was apprehensive when the Senator from Iowa suggested in presenting these petitions that there were two or three Senators who desired to speak for two or three minutes each. I did not object. There were petitions presented, signed, as I have been informed, by a very large number of American citizens, mostly women, I understand, but no doubt by a number of men also, relating to a subject of great public interest. I did not feel disposed under the circumstances to object to a brief discussion, although the time for discussion did not, as I thought, seem opportune just now. I feared then that what so often happens when we are promised that only a few moments will be occupied in doing something out of the rules, and the doing of which requires unanimous consent, expressed or implied, might result in the consumption of a large part of the morning hour, if not the whole of it. Instead of taking 6 or 8 minutes or 10 minutes, it has taken an hour and a half. The morning business has lost its place.

Mr. President, I pass from that subject now and will say just a word on the appeal I have taken from the ruling of the Chair. Undoubtedly—I think I can say undoubtedly—the purpose and policy of the rules when they were adopted and as they have been administered were to preserve the morning hour to the uses to which it was to be devoted. To say that a petition, which under the rule in express terms must be referred without debate, may be made a debatable question by a mere motion to refer is in effect an evasion of the rule. As the Senator from Indiana [Mr. KERN] suggests to me, it is not only an evasion, but a nullification of the rule.

Of course, the Chair understands without assurance that in asking, as I do by the appeal, to have the Senate itself pass on this question, it is done only in a kindly spirit, so far as the Chair is concerned, but I regard it as a matter of such far-reaching importance that we ought to be very careful about adopting that ruling, for we should thereby establish a precedent that would come home, Senators, all through the future years to plague the Senate, unless the rules themselves should be changed.

Mr. President, it endangers the business of the Senate—important business transacted in the morning hour—and I think it ought not to be done. A practice of that kind would be violative of the spirit, and I think also of the language, of the rule.

Therefore I have appealed, so as to get the judgment of the Senate upon it, whether or not the reference of a petition is debatable, and, coupling them as one question, whether a motion then made to refer is debatable.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming and Mr. BORAH addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Wyoming. Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. Mr. President, I have great respect for the rules of the Senate; I have a great desire to see the Senate's business conducted in accordance with those rules; I have great respect for the morning hour; but I think that there are things for which the ordinary business of the morning hour—

introducing bridge bills or public-building bills and things of that sort—may well be laid aside in the consideration of the greater questions that confront us.

I believe that the Chair is absolutely correct in his ruling that a motion to refer a petition, even though it be made in the morning hour, is debatable, and I think that is true, particularly upon an occasion of this sort, when it is a public question of the most momentous importance, as the Senator says. When are we to discuss these public questions of great importance? Has there one come before the Senate?

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me—

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. If the Senator will pardon me just a moment, I shall not speak more than a minute, and the Senator does not want to waste too much time—

Mr. STONE. I want to ask the Senator a question; that is all. I ask the Senator if he does not remember that a number of speeches have been already made before the Senate, and at great length, on this very subject of an embargo?

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. Mr. President, the Senator pointed to the clock a moment ago. I desire to say that more time has been consumed on the appeal of the Senator than was consumed on the discussion of the main question. When are we to have any opportunity to discuss these public questions? The Senator rises in his seat day after day and says the time is not opportune; that it is inappropriate; that these matters of great public importance must not be discussed in the Senate either in the morning hour or at any other time; that they must all be referred to a committee without discussion and that the merits of them must not be inquired into. Does the committee give us time for discussion?

Mr. STONE. I never said such a thing on the floor of the Senate or elsewhere.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. The Senator from Missouri for the past three weeks has been complaining of discussion in the Senate and has sought by argument, or at least by expression, to prevent discussion on the floor of the Senate, insisting that the time is too valuable; and at the same time the Senate adjourns for two or three days when all these great public questions are before the Senate and the country; and they are referred to committees. When will the committees give us some action on these questions?

I am not reflecting now upon the Committee on Foreign Relations, but I do say that it is trying the patience of the Senate when, not only for weeks, but for months and for years, resolutions have been pending touching great public affairs of this Nation and we are told to wait until the proper time comes for their discussion, while the resolutions and the bills in the meantime are reposing in the confidence and the secrecy of the committee.

I think, Mr. President, that the Chair is absolutely correct in his ruling, and I hope that the ruling will be sustained.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I sincerely hope that the decision of the Chair will be sustained. I believe that it is sound and that it is supported by authority and precedent.

But, sir, I trust that the Chair will be sustained for another and broader reason.

For 300 years the right of petition has been regarded as a sacred popular right. The framers of the Constitution sought to preserve the right to the people. The Constitution seems to guarantee to citizens the certain opportunity to have direct speech with their representative in Congress by petition. But the rules of the Senate make the right of petition little more than a sham and a mockery. Petitions are received without reading and referred without debate to a committee. That ends it. Petitions representing the arduous labor of months, expressing the hopes and convictions and prayers of thousands of people, are brought to the doors of this Chamber in the belief that they will receive the considerate attention of this body. They reach the Clerk's desk, are noted of record, and then go their way swiftly to the lasting silence of the committee's rubbish room.

Senators express the fear that if the ruling of the Chair is sustained every Senator thereafter presenting a petition will move its reference to some committee, and on that motion proceed to take up the time of the Senate debating the merits of the petition.

Mr. President, such fears are groundless. It will doubtless afford opportunity to bring a petition of special importance to the attention of the Senate. If it does this it will make the constitutional right of petition of some value to the people of the country and thereby subserve the public interest. Any attempt to abuse a privilege which a Senator would have in thus bringing to the notice of the Senate a petition of no concern to the country would defeat its own aims. But, sir, the petition before the Senate this morning justifies the severest

condemnation of the rule and the practice of the Senate, which in effect have operated to abolish the right of petition.

This petition speaks the mind and makes appeal for more than a million people. It cries out against the mercenary spirit that would coin the honor of our country into profits for the manufacturers of arms and ammunitions.

And it can only find expression through petition.

The subsidized press of the country is no indication of what the plain people are thinking. We should therefore give the largest possible consideration and weight to any other avenues of expression of which the people avail themselves. But out among the plain folk, let me say to you, there is a different speech. It was my privilege a little while ago to speak at St. Paul to 7,000 farmers, drawn from Montana, the two Dakotas, northern Iowa, Minnesota, and northern Wisconsin.

This body of representative farmers adopted resolutions condemning the preparedness program. Their action was not prearranged. It was spontaneous and unanimous. I believe they voiced the calm judgment of the agricultural population of the Middle West.

Mr. President, it is conceded that the manufacture and shipment of arms and munitions of war is within the accepted precedents and principles of international law as heretofore construed and maintained by this country and by most of the other countries of the world.

But, sir, never before in history has traffic in arms with belligerents had the significance that the shipment of munitions of war by us to Europe has to-day. The maintenance of that right by us has given the breath of life and perpetuity to a war that recognizes no compromise or finish except mutual extermination.

In the face of such a struggle, involving more than half the people of the world, which has already sacrificed 14,000,000 lives, precedents must yield to the appeal of a common humanity.

In my judgment, this petition is most significant as an expression of the sentiment of the masses of men and women of the United States.

After the first great horror to the plain people of this country of the war came the shock of learning that we are supplying the arms and ammunition to maintain it.

Those who assume that the average man and woman have become hardened to what is transpiring, that they go about their daily work unthinking and unmoved by the fact that the money power of America is reaping fabulous profits from the awful destruction of fellow men in Europe—those who make this assumption are mistaken. This monster petition is a demonstration of that fact.

The people of the East and, perhaps, of the populous centers of the West, under the influences of the financial, commercial, and industrial pressure, may appear to have caught the war fever and to be overwhelmed with fear of attack and mad for preparedness. But the great undercurrent of opinion of the common folk is one of solemn protest and indignation.

During the months that I was on the platform this summer I found the almost universal sentiment of my audiences to be of gratitude that we have been kept out of war, and a no less universal desire for some other way of settling international troubles than war.

The average man does not understand why the United States Congress and this administration are so indifferent to the world situation. I fully realize the enormous difficulties, but I believe that history will hold us accountable for our contribution to the general holocaust, and I think it will be hard for future generations to understand why the neutral powers kept aloof; why they did not unite, under the leadership of the United States, in an effort to restore peace and order. I believe, too, that if one-tenth part of the energy and time now directed in agitation and investigation of preparedness were to be turned toward other means of settlement of international problems for the future we should restore the confidence of the people and redeem our place in history.

This petition, although it relates more particularly to one phase of our responsibility, is a call to action. It should be heeded as an appeal for the higher statesmanship that these times demand.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I do not want the opportunity to pass without taking advantage of the moment to say that I believe in the right of petition as much as any man who ever lived, and that the rules of this body can never prevent the discussion of any subject that may be brought to the attention of the Senate through a petition. After the morning hour, which would perhaps have closed a few minutes after 12 o'clock, any Senator in this body could have spoken the remainder of the day upon the petition presented by the Senator from Iowa. No Senator could possibly be denied that privilege; I never

would want him to be denied it; and I never would support a ruling that would in any way deny him that right. A petition of this kind, as the Senator from Wisconsin has said, is indeed quite different from one that may be presented coming from an individual interested in an ordinary subject in regard to which he desires to appeal to Congress. Even the one citizen has the right to have presented such a petition; and, not only that, if he can interest a Senator of the United States to bring it to the attention of the people through the Senate, not one day but a month, if that one Senator can occupy the attention and the time of the Senate so long, can be consumed by him in discussing the subject in which that one citizen is interested.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Wisconsin?

Mr. SMOOT. Certainly.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. That is, on this particular occasion, after the routine business has been pursued and completed and after this petition had been carted away to the oblivion of some committee to which it might be referred, then, if I understand the Senator, he means that when the Philippines bill or some other bill came before the Senate some Senator, after the occasion passed, with the interest passed, might rise and, by the indulgence of the Senate, address himself to the principle involved in this petition when it was considering some other subject. Does the Senator conceive that to be a hearing upon a petition?

Mr. SMOOT. Not necessarily, Mr. President, the situation described by the Senator. The Senator must not feel that if these petitions were referred to a committee they would be carted into oblivion. The subject matter of these petitions, Mr. President, is one so grave that the mere reference of them to a committee can not place them in oblivion. The subject matter of these petitions will be discussed upon this floor during the next two or three months, not for one day, but perhaps for weeks.

I say to you, Mr. President, and to all the country that it is a most important subject, and I know that not only are the million who have signed the petitions interested in the matter, but that other millions in the United States are likewise interested. Mr. President, as far as I am concerned in this matter, that what I said about the rule I fully believe to be not only the rule of the body but its practice; and when I vote not to sustain the ruling of the Chair at this time I want it distinctly understood that I am not voting with reference to the petition or the subject of the petition in any way.

I simply wanted to say that much because I did not want to be placed in a wrong attitude before the people of the United States. It is for that reason, and that only, that I speak at this time, and I vote as I shall because I believe the rule to be as I have stated. Not only do I believe the rule to be that way, but it has been the practice. Through the rule and by the practice of the Senate no man or woman in the United States can ever be denied the right of petition or ever be denied a hearing upon this floor, if our rules are adhered to by this body.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. Mr. President, I have listened with some attention to what Senators who antagonize the ruling of the Chair have had to say without being convinced that the opinion I have heretofore expressed is erroneous.

The force of the argument seems to be that the rule announced by the Chair would destroy the morning hour. The morning hour is habitually destroyed by taking a recess from the day before whenever the exigencies of the occasion seem to demand such action. It is within the recollection of all Senators that it is likewise habitually set aside by the unanimous consent of the Senate on nearly every day for the purpose of considering, by unanimous consent, uncontested bills that are presented by the committees.

The rule is not likely to become abused, for the reason that it is at all times under the control of the Senate. If a motion to refer is made for captious purposes, or for purposes to delay, a motion to lay it on the table will take the whole matter out of the control of the Senate, if that is the wish of the Senate. There is not any possible force in the suggestion that we are deliberately abolishing the morning hour simply because we allow reasonable debate on a proposition to refer, or to take a matter from one committee and refer it to another, because the particular question now before the Senate is this:

The Chair announced that under the practice it would be proper to refer the petition to the Committee on Foreign Relations, but that he would recognize the Senator from Nebraska for the purpose of making a motion to refer the petition to the Committee on Commerce. The logical effect of that was a motion to discharge the Committee on Foreign Relations from the further consideration of the subject and substitute the

judgment of the Senate, if it should ratify the motion of the Senator from Nebraska. Everybody concedes that that motion, made in that form, by observing those formalities, would be debatable.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. Yes.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator knows that that motion could not be made in the morning hour.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. The Senator does not know any such thing. If he did, he would not be talking as he is talking now.

As the Chair properly said, it is a matter that is in confusion if we take the simple text of any one of the three rules that bear on the subject. The Chair is doing now what has been done for a hundred years—formulating a sensible and enforceable rule that in proper cases will extend a proper remedy. Whenever the abuse of it is to be dealt with, I take it for granted that the same ingenuity which the Senate always has exercised on such occasions will relieve it from any serious embarrassment.

I think the ruling of the Chair is right, and I intend to vote to sustain it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is, Shall the ruling of the Chair stand as the judgment of the Senate?

Mr. KENYON. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Hardwick	Nelson	Smith, Md.
Beckham	Hitchcock	Newlands	Smoot
Borah	Hollis	Norris	Sterling
Brandeggee	Hughes	O'Gorman	Stone
Bryan	Husting	Overman	Sutherland
Cañon	James	Page	Swanson
Chamberlain	Jones	Phelan	Thomas
Chilton	Kenyon	Pittman	Thompson
Clapp	Kern	Polindexter	Tillman
Clark, Wyo.	La Follette	Pomeroy	Townsend
Clarke, Ark.	Lane	Robinson	Vardaman
Cummins	Lee, Tenn.	Shafroth	Wadsworth
Curtis	Lee, Md.	Sheppard	Walsh
Dillingham	Lippitt	Sherman	Warren
du Pont	McCumber	Shields	Weeks
Fletcher	Martin, Va.	Simmons	Williams
Gronna	Martine, N. J.	Smith, Ariz.	Works.
Harding	Myers	Smith, Ga.	

Mr. TOWNSEND. The senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. SMITH] is paired with the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED]. I desire that this announcement may stand on all votes for the day.

Mr. CURTIS. I am requested to announce that the senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER] is unavoidably detained from the Senate, and that the junior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. GOFF] is detained on account of sickness.

Mr. STONE. I desire to announce the absence of the junior Senator from Delaware [Mr. SAULSBURY] on account of illness. He is paired with the junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. COIT]. I will let this announcement stand for the day.

Mr. BORAH. I desire to announce the absence of my colleague [Mr. BRADY] on account of illness. He is paired with the junior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. JOHNSON]. I will let this announcement stand for the day.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I have been requested to announce the absence of the junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] owing to illness in his family.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Seventy-one Senators have answered to the roll call. There is a quorum present.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, inasmuch as something like two hours have been taken up in debate, and I imagine all Senators who desire to express themselves on the general subject embodied in the proposed legislation have said what they wished to say, not desiring now to further detain the Senate, I will, with the consent of the Senate, withdraw the appeal, stating, however, that I challenge and protest against the ruling, and that on some future occasion when the question arises I shall be glad to debate the matter again before the Chair and the Senate and ask the judgment of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Before the record is finally made the Chair desires to announce, in connection with the ruling, that the Chair is not of the opinion that the ruling of the Chair made on June 21, 1913, is at all in conflict with the ruling made to-day. That ruling was in connection with a communication from the Attorney General of the United States, and was neither a petition nor a memorial.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to withdraw my motion to refer the petition to the Committee on Commerce, and I leave the matter to the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair will refer the petition to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, I send to the desk a very short letter, which I ask may be read and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

There being no objection, the letter was read and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

BERLIN, December 18, 1915.

Senator HOKE SMITH, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: As our association has stood, and still stands, for the development and promotion of American trade with Germany, we take the liberty of bringing the two following cases to your notice.

We have since outbreak of the war had several instances where American goods have been held up by the British Government, causing our American branches in Germany a great deal of trouble. If this policy is continued, the offices of our American houses will have to close business.

One of the two very flagrant cases we are sending you to-day is the complaint of the representative of the John B. Stetson Co., of Philadelphia—members of ours—in which we are informed that goods will not be accepted in New York by the steamship companies for transportation unless certified to by a sworn statement that such goods will not go to Germany or the central powers. The John B. Stetson Co. have until recently been able to get their goods through to Germany via the Scandinavian countries.

The second complaint is that of our member, the Remington Typewriter Co., which company has succeeded in getting its goods as far as Göteborg, but can not honestly make a sworn statement that the goods are not intended for Germany. One very interesting fact in connection with this latter case is that these goods, being some hundred cases of typewriters, are allowed to go to Russia.

We would also call your attention to the fact that the British Government, in refusing to allow these goods to enter Germany, is striking a blow at American trade and only assisting German typewriter firms to better compete with the American product.

We are well aware that you must be flooded with similar requests from our American firms, but as these two firms are well known all over the United States, we think you might be able to make good use of these two cases and possibly bring the matter before Congress.

If this policy continues to be pursued by Great Britain, it will in very short time completely ruin American trade in Germany and Austria, which it has required many years of hard work and painstaking to build up.

Knowing, as we do, that you take great interest in this matter, and trusting that any efforts you may make will create a more favorable situation, as we take the standpoint that United States manufacturers have the perfect right to do business with any belligerent, provided the products in question are not contraband.

We have the honor to remain,

Very truly, yours,

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF COMMERCE AND TRADE,
Geo. S. Atwood, Secretary.

Mr. NELSON presented a memorial of the Layman's Missionary Association of Duluth, Minn., remonstrating against the repeal of the treaty of 1855 prohibiting the sale of intoxicants in certain territory in the State of Minnesota, which was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

He also presented a memorial of the Commercial Club of Little Falls, Minn., remonstrating against a tax on gasoline, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. ROBINSON. I have a letter from Mr. J. D. Goldman, president of the Lesser-Goldman Cotton Co., of St. Louis, Mo., in regard to the cotton-futures act, and with especial reference to section 11 of that act. I ask that the letter may be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

There being no objection, the letter was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ST. LOUIS, Mo., January 15, 1916.

Hon. Jos. T. ROBINSON,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: In regard to the cotton-futures act which has been reintroduced in the House by Mr. LEVER, section 11 of the bill forbids sending orders to buy or sell futures on the foreign exchanges, and, in consequence, the European merchants are given such an advantage that it is possible for them to monopolize the export business, which amounts to 60 per cent of the American cotton crop.

In consequence of this, the American cotton merchant hereafter can deal only with the European merchant by reason of the fact that he can not deal direct with the consumer abroad, as the consumers abroad buy for forward deliveries, and always buy based on Liverpool or Havre futures, and if we sell cotton abroad for forward delivery the natural hedge is the market in which we sell the cotton and not in the New York or New Orleans markets, which in no way reflect the variations in exchange, freights, etc.

We also do not see how we can continue to ship cotton to Europe for sale on or after arrival, for the reason that if we ship or hedge in New York we run the risk of the freight and exchange markets between the time the cotton is shipped and sold, and, as freights are seven times higher than normal values, this is a risk no one wants to undertake.

Consequently the effect of section 11 is as follows:

First. European merchants are given a monopoly of the European business, competition is restricted, and prices are affected in this country.

Second. By reason of the fact that the American merchants can not do a forward business and are unwilling to ship cotton to Liverpool on consignment and hedge in this country, exports are obstructed, and the surplus of the crop is remaining in this country and affecting prices.

LESSER-GOLDMAN COTTON CO.,
COTTON BUYERS,
112-114 South Main Street, St. Louis, Mo., January 15, 1916.

Hon. J. T. ROBINSON:

We are inclosing you an example of a transaction showing clearly the injustice done to an American cotton merchant, who is obliged under the Lever bill to hedge in New York.

This bill affects the cotton merchant in this way: They have many times during the season opportunities to buy in the interior on a safe Liverpool basis, and if they can do so they would take the cotton off the market and sell in Liverpool against their purchases; but, as the Lever bill prohibits this, they are obliged to stay out of the market and the cotton then becomes a weight until such time as the American mills may want it or there is an outlet from some other source. As the mills generally know the amount of cotton left in the country they take their time about buying, and for that reason it very often depresses values, as the cotton merchant can not relieve the situation unless he can insure himself by covers against loss.

As this bill in its present form is so obviously unfair to the American cotton merchant, we are writing you to call your attention to the objectionable feature of the bill and ask you to vote for the elimination of section 11 when the bill is again presented, leaving the rest of the bill intact.

Yours, very truly,

LESSER-GOLDMAN COTTON CO.,
By J. D. GOLDMAN, President.

Example of 100 bales of cotton sold Sept. 1 for shipment to Liverpool, hedged by the purchase of 100 bales January contracts New York or hedged by the purchase of 100 bales of January-February contracts in Liverpool and liquidated Jan. 6, 1916.

Sold Sept. 1, 100 bales middling Texas, January shipment; cost, freight, insurance, and 6 per cent tare Liverpool (basis ocean freight at \$1.25)..... \$12.94
Bought Sept. 1, 100 January contracts, New York..... 10.28

TRANSACTION LIQUIDATED JAN. 6.

Bought Jan. 6, 100 B/C middling Texas, January shipment; cost, freight, insurance, and 6 per cent tare Liverpool (basis ocean freight, \$2.75)..... 16.65
Sold Jan. 6, 100 January contracts, New York..... 12.25

NET RESULT OF TRANSACTION BASED ON NEW YORK HEDGE.

Sold Sept. 1, 100 middling Texas..... 12.94
Bought Jan. 6, 100 middling Texas..... 16.65

Loss on spots, 371 points.

Bought Sept. 1, 100 January contracts..... 10.28

Sold Jan. 6, 100 January contracts..... 12.25

Profit on futures, 197 points.

Net loss on transaction based on New York hedge, 174 points, equal \$8.70 per bale.

SAME TRANSACTION BASED ON LIVERPOOL HEDGE.

Sold Sept. 1, 100 bales middling Texas, January shipment; cost, freight, insurance, and 6 per cent tare Liverpool (basis ocean freight, \$1.25)..... \$12.94
Bought Sept. 1, 100 January-February contracts Liverpool..... 5.92

TRANSACTION LIQUIDATED JAN. 6.

Bought Jan. 6, 100 bales middling Texas, January shipment; cost, freight, insurance, and 6 per cent tare Liverpool (basis ocean freight, \$2.75)..... 16.65
Sold Jan. 6, 100 January-February, Liverpool..... 8.00

NET RESULT OF TRANSACTION BASED ON LIVERPOOL HEDGE.

Sold Sept. 1, 100 middling Texas..... 12.94
Bought Jan. 6, 100 middling Texas..... 16.65

Loss on spots, 371 points.

Bought Sept. 1, 100 January-February contracts, Liverpool..... 5.92

Sold Jan. 6, 100 January-February contracts, Liverpool..... 8.00

Profit on futures, 208 Liverpool points, or 416 American points.

Net profit on transaction based, 45 American points, equal to \$2.25 per bale.

Therefore, if the transaction had been hedged in New York, there would have been a loss of \$8.70 per bale.

If hedged in Liverpool, a profit of \$2.25 per bale.

Difference in favor of Liverpool, \$10.95 per bale.

EXPLANATION.

September 1: January New York, \$10.20; January-February Liverpool, \$5.92; difference equal 156 points.

January 6: January New York, \$12.25; January-February Liverpool, \$8.00; difference equal 375 points.

New York advanced 197 points; Liverpool advanced 416 points

Liverpool advance compared with New York is represented by advance in freight.

Mr. KERN presented memorials of sundry citizens of Allen County and of Noblesville and South Wabash, all in the State of Indiana, remonstrating against an increase in armaments, which were referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented a petition of the Sud-Seite Schwaben, of Indianapolis, Ind., and a petition of sundry citizens of Grant County, Ind., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit citizens of this country from using the ships of belligerent nations, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Saratoga, Ind., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit interstate commerce in the products of child labor, which were referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. WARREN presented a petition of Local Grange No. 19, Patrons of Husbandry, of Eden, Wyo., praying for the establishment of a system of rural credits, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. WEEKS presented a petition of sundry citizens of Boston, Mass., praying for a readjustment of the tax on the admission to theaters, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Boston, Mass., praying for the imposition of a duty on dyestuffs, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Holyoke, Mass., praying for Federal censorship of motion pictures, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also presented petitions of the Federated Irish Societies of Massachusetts, praying for the placing of an embargo on munitions of war, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. WADSWORTH presented petitions of the congregation of the First Congregational Church of Bay Shore; of the Centenary Methodist Episcopal Church, of Malone; and of sundry citizens of Albany, all in the State of New York, praying for Federal censorship of motion pictures, which were referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also presented petitions of the Ingalls Co. and the A. C. Cheney Piano Action Co., of Castleton; of the H. F. Chalfonte Paper Co., of Rock City Falls; and of John Leggett & Son, of Troy, all in the State of New York, praying for the imposition of a duty on dyestuffs, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. PAGE presented a petition of the Ryegate Paper Co., of East Ryegate, Vt., praying for the imposition of a tax on dyestuffs, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. DU PONT presented petitions of sundry citizens of Wilmington and Greenwood, in the State of Delaware, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution granting the right of suffrage to women, which were ordered to lie on the table.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. LEA of Tennessee, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, to which was referred Senate resolution No. 43, for the appointment of a committee to investigate and inquire into the causes of the existing freight blockade and embargoes on the trunk-line railroads entering into the port of New York, reported it with an amendment.

He also, from the Committee on Privileges and Elections, to which was referred the bill (S. 668) making it unlawful for any Member of Congress to serve on or solicit funds for any political committee, club, or organization, reported it with an amendment and submitted a report (No. 73) thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to which were referred the following bills, reported them each without amendment and submitted reports thereon:

S. 665. A bill to codify, revise, and amend the laws relating to publicity of contributions and expenditures made for the purpose of influencing the nomination and election of candidates for the offices of Representative and Senator in the Congress of the United States, limiting the amount of campaign expenses, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 74); and

S. 669. A bill to limit the use of campaign funds in presidential and national elections (Rept. No. 75).

Mr. HUGHES (for Mr. SHIVELY) submitted a report (No. 71), accompanied by a bill (S. 3984) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors, which was read twice by its title, the bill being a substitute for the following Senate bills heretofore referred to that committee:

- S. 9. Patience Rosa Archer.
- S. 86. John T. Pribble.
- S. 87. Sarah Saxey.
- S. 88. Erasmus W. Tatlock.
- S. 104. Silas W. Norris.
- S. 118. Simeon L. Wilson.
- S. 120. John Nighswander.
- S. 123. William E. Howard.
- S. 148. Paleman S. Castle.
- S. 150. Jennie R. Cusick.
- S. 170. Annie Bridges.
- S. 173. Rosa Rossiter.
- S. 182. Anna Barker.
- S. 183. Gustav Schoneck.
- S. 203. Theodore Basterdes.
- S. 209. Margaret P. Sherman.
- S. 249. Charles R. Potter.
- S. 297. Hiram F. Brundage.
- S. 354. Mary C. Hills.
- S. 363. Patrick J. Quigley.

- S. 368. Nellie Judkins.
- S. 369. Alva M. Titchout.
- S. 371. Francis Blanchard.
- S. 402. Fidelia M. Waffle.
- S. 423. John R. Mabee.
- S. 525. William I. Scott.
- S. 528. Edwin D. Kaynor.
- S. 533. George A. Barker.
- S. 534. Melcenia C. Baker.
- S. 566. Christiana H. Nicholls.
- S. 658. John S. Corson.
- S. 659. Clarinda A. Spear.
- S. 663. Daniel L. Thompson.
- S. 772. Robert H. Barton.
- S. 859. Aad Peterson.
- S. 960. Adeline Reynolds.
- S. 962. George H. Shefter.
- S. 964. John F. Treadwell.
- S. 965. Henry G. Wilson.
- S. 994. John R. Snook.
- S. 997. Elizabeth Kniffin.
- S. 1008. David Youts.
- S. 1014. George Bateson.
- S. 1018. Daniel W. Coan.
- S. 1043. Mary King.
- S. 1108. John W. Greene.
- S. 1110. Peter S. Hare.
- S. 1119. Jefferson Lyons.
- S. 1125. Andy Perrin.
- S. 1127. Burton Gillaspie.
- S. 1135. Henry Creery.
- S. 1144. Turner Barns.
- S. 1146. Rachel A. Woodmausee.
- S. 1154. James E. Bacon.
- S. 1238. Alden Powers.
- S. 1239. Duane F. Perkins.
- S. 1249. Sylvester Stewart.
- S. 1305. Joseph F. Grawe.
- S. 1329. George F. Cowan.
- S. 1335. Frederick A. Heebner.
- S. 1347. William H. Manley.
- S. 1419. William Cake (alias William Baker).
- S. 1427. William H. Hills.
- S. 1440. Eliza J. Banning.
- S. 1443. Martha Connor.
- S. 1444. Anastasia Corcoran.
- S. 1446. Mary C. Daniels.
- S. 1451. Sarah F. Hovey.
- S. 1505. William Roubesh.
- S. 1507. Charles Whittkemper.
- S. 1508. John Smiley.
- S. 1511. Nancy Wilson.
- S. 1516. William Whitten.
- S. 1518. Georgia B. Nelson.
- S. 1521. Sarah T. Wright.
- S. 1522. Eliza J. Wells.
- S. 1524. John M. Pittman.
- S. 1531. Martha A. Reynolds.
- S. 1694. Albert A. Lance.
- S. 1729. Oliver K. Landrew.
- S. 1735. George Crawford.
- S. 1785. Edward Morris.
- S. 1787. Nelson Briley.
- S. 1789. James L. Spaulding.
- S. 1794. James M. Jameson.
- S. 1928. Henry Wilcox.
- S. 1935. James A. Snodgrass.
- S. 1941. James P. Weter.
- S. 1945. William H. Lewis.
- S. 1957. Elias B. Thompson.
- S. 1962. Sarah E. Prender.
- S. 2243. Enoch F. Anderson.
- S. 2246. Maria Savage.
- S. 2251. Marrietta Fowler.
- S. 2283. Francis B. Nofsinger.
- S. 2294. John Alexander.
- S. 2313. Mary Jane Drew.
- S. 2333. Enoch M. Martin.
- S. 2350. Gardner B. Taylor.
- S. 2400. Agnes E. Tooker.
- S. 2479. Nelson Haggerty.
- S. 2488. Minnie Mahler.
- S. 2494. Annie T. McCreary.
- S. 2495. James A. Lucas.

S. 2516. Amanda Phillips.
 S. 2523. Ellen L. Webster.
 S. 2561. Annie E. Nave.
 S. 2577. Maria J. Mahon.
 S. 2583. Sigmund Bauer.
 S. 2655. Martin B. Worrell.
 S. 2733. Ruth A. Smith.
 S. 2786. Edwin W. Haynes.
 S. 2866. Daniel K. Cummings.
 S. 2867. James M. Crossman.
 S. 2877. George Dallison.
 S. 2906. Elijah Booher.
 S. 2927. Mary E. Taylor.
 S. 2944. Burton Vanhook.
 S. 2945. Andrew J. Woolf.
 S. 2952. John Woods.
 S. 2996. Milton P. Julian.
 S. 3068. Mary C. Lyon.
 S. 3080. Lucie B. Kasson.
 S. 3113. Norman B. Stacy.
 S. 3138. Florence K. Patterson.
 S. 3214. Mary A. Hoon.
 S. 3299. Milton T. Callahan, jr.
 S. 3363. William Thomas.
 S. 3366. Edmund Hishley.
 S. 3399. Stephen P. Stites.
 S. 3411. Carrie V. Lawton.
 S. 3427. John M. Null.
 S. 3437. Mary H. Babcock.
 S. 3440. John Johnston.
 S. 949. Ella Taylor.
 S. 3515. Sidney A. Ladd.
 S. 3627. Daniel Casey.
 S. 3652. Jameson S. Tweed.
 S. 3698. Lucinda Applegate.
 S. 3717. Bernard McNancy.

Mr. HUGHES (for Mr. SHIVELY), from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 8493) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War, and certain widows and dependent children of soldiers and sailors of said war, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 72) thereon.

Mr. WADSWORTH, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 37) to amend Senate joint resolution No. 8, approved May 4, 1898, entitled "Joint resolution providing for the adjustment of certain claims of the United States against the State of Tennessee and certain claims against the United States," reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 88) thereon.

Mr. SMOOT, from the Committee on Public Lands, to which were referred the following bills, reported them severally without amendment and submitted reports thereon:

S. 31. A bill for the relief of John L. Sevy (Rept. No. 83);
 S. 32. A bill for the relief of William G. Williams, sr. (Rept. No. 84);
 S. 33. A bill for the relief of Daniel M. Frost (Rept. No. 85); and

S. 36. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to issue patents for certain lands to the town of Duchesne, Utah (Rept. No. 86).

Mr. OVERMAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to which was referred the bill (S. 3346) conferring jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to adjudicate the claims of the State of Massachusetts, asked to be discharged from its further consideration and that it be referred to the Committee on Claims; which was agreed to.

Mr. CURTIS, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, to which was referred the bill (S. 3391) to amend an act entitled "An act for the relief of Indians occupying railroad lands in Arizona, New Mexico, or California," approved March 4, 1913, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 87) thereon.

Mr. MYERS, from the Committee on Public Lands, to which was referred the following bills, reported them each without amendment and submitted reports thereon:

S. 1388. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to furnish hot water from the hot springs on the Hot Springs Reservation for drinking and bathing purposes free of cost to the Leo N. Levi Memorial Hospital Association (Rept. No. 82); and
 S. 1843. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire certain right of way near Engle, N. Mex. (Rept. No. 81).

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill (S. 3132) providing for the homestead entry of certain lands in the State of Washington, and for other purposes, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 79) thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to which were referred the following bills, reported them severally with an amendment and submitted reports thereon:

S. 1840. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act to establish a Court of Private Land Claims and to provide for the settlement of private land claims in certain States and Territories," approved March 3, 1891, and the acts amendatory thereto, approved February 21, 1893, June 27, 1898, and February 26, 1909 (Rept. No. 80); and

S. 3581. A bill releasing the claim of the United States Government to that portion of land, being a fractional block, bounded on the north and east by Bayou Cadet, on the west by Cevallos Street, and on the south by Intendencia Street, in the old city of Pensacola, Fla. (Rept. No. 78).

RICHARD DAELEY.

Mr. MYERS. From the Committee on Public Lands I report back favorably, with an amendment, the bill (S. 809) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to accept the application for land entry of Richard Daeley, and I submit a report (No. 76) thereon. I call the attention of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER] to the report.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be placed on the calendar.

LAND IN PENSACOLA, FLA.

Mr. MYERS. From the Committee on Public Lands I report back favorably, without amendment, the bill (S. 3580) releasing the claim of the United States Government to lot numbered 306 in the old city of Pensacola, Fla., and I submit a report (No. 77) thereon. I call the attention of the Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER] to the report.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President—

Mr. SMOOT. Let us get through with the morning business. The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be placed on the calendar.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. WARREN:

A bill (S. 3985) for the relief of C. E. Anderson; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 3986) granting certain coal lands to the town of Kaycee, Wyo. (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 3987) to patent certain lands to the State of Wyoming; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. HOLLIS:

A bill (S. 3988) to correct the military record of Joseph Kenney; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FLETCHER:

A bill (S. 3989) for the relief of Luanna Ross; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. O'GORMAN:

A bill (S. 3990) for the relief of Samuel A. Russel; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CHAMBERLAIN:

A bill (S. 3991) granting an increase of pension to Frederick J. Young (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 3992) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Campbell (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 3993) granting an increase of pension to Charles S. Thompson (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 3994) granting an increase of pension to Jonas O. Johnson (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 3995) granting a pension to Alice A. Kearney (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WORKS:

A bill (S. 3996) granting an increase of pension to Mattie Tryon Spangler (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 3997) granting an increase of pension to Ledroit C. Prosser (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MARTIN of Virginia:

A bill (S. 3998) to amend an act relating to the public utilities commission of the District of Columbia, approved March 4, 1913; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. WEEKS:

A bill (S. 3999) to remove the charge of desertion against James Madden; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KERN:

A bill (S. 4000) granting an increase of pension to John L. Blackburn (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 4001) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Beckwith (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 4002) granting an increase of pension to Thomas J. Yount (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 4003) granting an increase of pension to Edward D. Litsey (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 4004) granting a pension to Nelson White (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 4005) granting an increase of pension to Emily P. Hubbard (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 4006) granting an increase of pension to George W. McComb (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (S. 4007) to correct the military record of Ralph Cloud;

A bill (S. 4008) for the relief of John Fitzgerald (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 4009) for the relief of Nathan Manzer (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 4010) for the relief of Thomas J. Gardner (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 4011) for the relief of William H. Lung (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DU PONT:

A bill (S. 4012) granting an increase of pension to Ruth A. Hazzard; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey:

A bill (S. 4013) granting an increase of pension to William J. Hull (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. POMERENE (for Mr. SAULSBURY):

A bill (S. 4014) to supplement existing legislation relative to the United States Court for China and to increase the serviceability thereof; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

OIL AND GAS LANDS.

Mr. WARREN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 406) to authorize exploration for and disposition of coal, phosphate, oil, gas, potassium, or sodium, which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands and ordered to be printed.

THE NAVY.

Mr. TILLMAN. Mr. President, I desire to give notice that to-morrow, Friday, the 28th instant, after the conclusion of the routine morning business, I shall address the Senate on the subject of the Navy.

GOVERNMENT OF THE PHILIPPINES.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which is Senate bill 381.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 381) to declare the purpose of the people of the United States as to the future political status of the people of the Philippine Islands and to provide a more autonomous government for those islands.

[Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas addressed the Senate. See Appendix.]

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, I am very sorry that the Senator from Arkansas has seen fit in his wisdom to propose this very radical amendment to this very well-considered bill, a bill which has not only been considered in the present Senate Committee on the Philippines, but in the Senate Committee on the Philippines of the preceding Congress, and which, substantially in its present form, passed the House of Representatives after full consideration by the committee there.

I recognize, Mr. President, however, that there is—particularly on this side of the Chamber—a strong sentiment favorable to the idea which this amendment proposes to enact. It is apparently an impulsive and rather thoughtless sentiment in favor of getting rid of the Philippines regardless of the consequences, regardless of the history of the past 15 years, regardless of the interests over there which have become vested under American control, and regardless of the international results which are likely to follow. Out of deference to that sentiment on this side of the Chamber, I propose to-day particularly to point out what I consider to be some very serious defects in the pending amendment, even if it is proposed to enact it.

I ask the attention of the Senator from Arkansas to what I shall say in the nature of an analysis of the amendment that he proposes. First, let me draw attention to the difference between the bill and the amendment. The bill proposes to carry out the past policy of the United States with regard to the Philippine Islands by giving to the people of the Philippines a larger degree of self-government than they have ever had in their history before. It also proposes in the preamble to give to the

Philippine people the pledge of the United States that some day it is the intention of the United States to bestow independence upon them when their permanent interests require it.

Now, I shall not discuss the reasons for that phraseology in the preamble. I may say to the Senate that the committees that considered the preamble found great difficulty in agreeing on the phraseology, and that the phraseology finally adopted was in the nature of a compromise in order to come as near as possible to harmonizing the different views of Senators, and with the view all the time of conveying to the Philippine people such a promise as would satisfy them with the present legislation, and such a promise as would lead them on in the course of the development of self-government to higher and higher standards. But that preamble I shall not consider.

Let me now draw attention to the amendment, which is really the pending question before the Senate. The Senator from Arkansas first drew his amendment so that it would result in the separation of the Philippine Islands from the United States within two years. He soon found, after he had presented it and discussed it informally, that that would not do. He soon found that that was impracticable.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. Let me say to the Senator I did not change two years to four years as a result of any attention I gave the subject. I think two years amply sufficient now, but I had to conform to the views of other Senators. If anybody is responsible for that, the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. OVERMAN] is.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I will change it. I will say the Senator from Arkansas soon found that it was necessary to change the amendment, just as I think I can demonstrate to him it will be necessary to change the present amendment, either to secure votes for it or to comply with obligations which I am sure the Senator from Arkansas will recognize when I point them out.

First, he provides in his amendment that the President, within four years, must act, unless after the four years have expired he finds conditions such that he should not act. The Senator evidently intends to say that the President shall act within four years, unless some time during the four-year period he finds he should not act before the limit arrives. There is a slight change which he must make if he would make his amendment workable.

The President of the United States is required by this mandatory provision to act within four years; and yet it is said that after the four years have expired, if he finds at that time, after he has failed to comply with the law, he may then find a reason for not complying with it and submit it to Congress. He evidently intends, I am sure, to provide that if the President finds at any time during the four years—

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. No; the Senator is entirely mistaken. It is contemplated that there will be some strife among political parties. It may go beyond permissible lengths; it may be to-morrow. It may arise and disappear before the expiration of the four years; but if there is a continuing condition such as to warrant the President in saying it is likely to grow infinitely worse, and in growing worse involve upon us the exercise of authority, to give time to submit it to another Congress, to see whether or not it is necessary to somewhat modify the rule laid down in existing law.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. But the Senator does not submit it to Congress.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. Congress needs no right. The President has a right to submit to Congress anything he desires to submit at any time. It is not necessary to confer this by statute. On the other hand, Congress can take up the whole subject, without reference to the President or anybody else, at any session of Congress, this one included.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Does the Senator intend by his amendment that the President may submit it at any time?

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. No; it simply affords Congress an opportunity to take it up without the President. It is not necessary to submit it in order to confer jurisdiction on Congress to deal with it again.

The amendment itself settles that. That answers the question.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. If the President fails to act within four years, he has violated this act.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. Yes; if he fails to act in four years and does not extend the time, he has violated the act and violated his oath of office.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Then you compel him to violate the act before he submits it to Congress.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. We do not compel him to submit it to Congress. He issues a proclamation extending the policy.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. But you compel him to violate the act.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. I do not know what the Senator means by that.

Mr. LIPPITT. Mr. President, I can not believe that the Senator from Arkansas realizes what the Senator from Nebraska means, because it is very plain that the intent of the Senator from Arkansas is not covered by the language of the act.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. That is rather a minor matter, and I shall proceed to the next difficulty. Under the amendment which the Senator offers the President is only permitted to submit this question again to Congress in case the interests of the Philippines make it desirable.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. No; it does not say that. It says if he shall find as a fact that the condition of the internal or external affairs of the Philippines in respect to the stability or efficiency of the proposed government would warrant him in so doing.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I am sure the Senator ought to include in that, whether it is his intention or not, a direction to the President of the United States to submit the matter to Congress if he finds that the interests of the United States makes it mandatory.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. The supposition is that we shall have the services of the able Senator from Nebraska before the five years run out, and if the interest of the United States is jeopardized in the slightest degree he will not fail to exercise his constitutional function.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Later on I can tell the Senator from Arkansas better whether I will be here in five years, but the amendment as drawn by the Senator takes into account nothing but the interest of the Philippine Islands and makes no provision for the President submitting the matter to Congress in case he should find it vitally necessary for the interest of the American people. He expects the President to live up to this act. He expects the President to carry out its terms. Should he not include a direction to the President to lay the matter before Congress if he finds it either to the interest of the Philippine Islands or of the American people?

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. The reply to the Senator's question is that I do not direct the President ever to submit it to Congress at any time or under any circumstances. It would simply force Congress to take it up. If it sees proper to do so—

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I will read the language:

Provided, That if the President, at the expiration of the said period of four years, shall find that the condition of the internal or external affairs of said Philippines in respect to the stability or efficiency of the proposed government thereof is such as to warrant him in so doing, he is hereby further authorized, by proclamation duly made and published, to extend the said time to and including the date of the final adjournment of the session of Congress which shall convene next after the date of the expiration of the said period of four years.

Now, I ask the Senator, suppose the President of the United States found it vitally necessary for the interests of the United States that this period should be extended?

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. If he did his duty and observed his oath he would submit it to Congress, if it required congressional action.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Why has not the Senator included that here?

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. I have not directed him to submit anything. I simply give him an opportunity to take it up.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. The Senator from Arkansas has given the power to extend the period, if the interests of the Philippines demand it, but he has not given the President the power to extend the period if the interests of the United States demand it.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. The Senator is entirely mistaken about that. The phrase he is criticizing is the work of probably the best lawyer on this floor, and he is not a supporter of this amendment, either. It is the delegation of power to the President to suspend an existing law, and it must be carefully done. There is very little latitude allowed in cases of that kind. That would be the only reason the President would have for extending it, because it is the only reason that can exist. As long as we are responsible for governmental conditions in the Philippine Islands nothing could happen there that would disturb the internal or external relations of that country without involving the United States, and the thing that would present one condition would present the other. I did not think it was necessary to amplify something that by implication is so plainly provided for.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. The Senator in his amendment gives the President the power to extend the period one year if the interest of the Philippine Islands demands it, but he has not permitted the President to extend it five minutes in case the interest of the United States demands it. I think that is an omission which

clearly should be made good, if the amendment is to be voted upon with a view to the interest of the United States.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President, does the Senator from Nebraska recognize the fact that we are going to have at least four sessions of Congress between now and the time when the four-year limit will be up? Of course, if the President of the United States finds that there is any interest of the United States that should be protected he has those four years before the time of his proclamation to call the attention of the Senate and House and ask for their advice or their consideration of the same.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, I am very well aware that Congresses will come and go before this period of four years elapses, and for that very reason I think this Congress should not undertake to fix a date. I think it should leave it as it left it in the case of Cuba. I think any attempt to fix a date in advance is a dangerous exercise of power. We do not know what the four years will bring forth.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ROBINSON in the chair). Does the Senator from Nebraska yield further to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Yes.

Mr. SHAFROTH. One of the main objects of fixing the date is to assure the Philippine people that they will get their independence. There is always a feeling of unrest where it is uncertain as to whether they will get their independence. They are unanimous about it, and if it is hedged around with too many ifs and ands the result will be that they will come to the conclusion that the United States does not intend to give them independence. That produces unrest, it produces conditions which are bad, and it might even produce revolution or insurrection. We do not want to have—

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, I can not yield for a speech.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Very well.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I yielded for a reasonable interruption. I realize that the amendment is an attempt to fix a definite date, but it does not do it. There is still a string tied to it, a string which the President is to pull. Even under this amendment the Philippine people may not have their independence for 20 years. It is not made definite. In my opinion the preamble which is presented to the Senate by the committee, and for which the Senator from Colorado voted, and which I supposed had his approval, is a preamble which once adopted binds the United States much more firmly to a policy of independence than this amendment.

Mr. HARDWICK. Will the Senator yield to me for a moment?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Yes.

Mr. HARDWICK. If the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas is adopted the Philippine people will get their independence without further congressional action, unless Congress should change its policy in the future?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Yes.

Mr. HARDWICK. Whereas if the preamble, as suggested by the Senator, were adopted that would not be true?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Yes; they would get their independence.

Mr. HARDWICK. But not without further affirmative congressional action?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. That is true; but Congress would be morally bound to give it.

Mr. HARDWICK. The action in the one case—

Mr. HITCHCOCK. There is that difference. It is not an absolute grant of independence.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President, I should like to state to the Senator from Nebraska that I did vote for the preamble because, under the conditions that existed in the committee, it was about the best that we could get. The Senator knows from the various expressions that I made during the proceedings of the committee that I was always in favor of a stronger preamble than we produced, but as a matter of compromise we did as a matter of fact agree to it, reserving, however, the right to make liberal amendments when it came to the Senate.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. That is true, Mr. President, except as to the reservation. I supposed that the members of the committee on this side of the Chamber at least would be bound by the committee report.

Mr. SHAFROTH. No; at the very time the Senator from Iowa [Mr. KENYON] and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. CLAPP] said that they wanted to reserve the right to amend I stated that I did not suppose anyone was bound as to this matter. We were trying to get an early report to the Senate.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Now, Mr. President, I proceed to the third point of criticism of this amendment. It provides that the Philippine government shall protect and guarantee personal and prop-

erty rights of Americans. It makes no provision, no condition, that the new government set up there shall not be recognized until it protects and guarantees the rights of other nationalities in the islands. Yet, Mr. President, we as a Nation are not only morally bound to do so but we are specifically bound to do so by the terms of the treaty of Paris. If this is an amendment which my friends on this side of the Chamber desire to engraft upon the bill, they should at least take the precautions which were taken in regard to Cuba and provide in this amendment that no government should be recognized there until it had bound itself to guarantee not only American rights in the islands but other rights which have become vested under the protection of the American flag, rights which we have solemnly promised Spain in the treaty of Paris we would see were protected.

I certainly think that the Senator from Arkansas can hardly be willing to leave his amendment in such a shape as not to protect those rights, compelling the President to recognize a government in the Philippine Islands before he has secured from it sufficient guaranties for the protection of the rights of other nationalities in those islands, rights which are as good as American rights.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. The Senator need not consume any time on that proposition. I am perfectly willing, in the line where it says "citizens or corporations of the United States," to insert the words "or others." I do not believe other nations expect us, in dealing with a sovereign—as I hope to see the Philippine Islands before long—to take care of their own interests. I believe they can do that in the Philippines. They generally do that elsewhere for themselves. If it will obviate the necessity of discussing it, I have no objection to putting in the words "or others."

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I am glad to hear the Senator say these are rights we ought to protect.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. We ought to protect the Philippines as far as we can so long as we stay there and protect our own rights.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President, is it possible the President of the United States will not protect rights without specifying in a provision that he shall do it? It is absurd.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. In answer to that, I may say the Congress of the United States did not leave this matter as it stands in the case of Cuba. The Congress of the United States instructed its agents to require of the constitutional convention of Cuba that it should enter into certain obligations to do the things which I think we should now require the new government in the Philippine Islands to do. It is easy to frame a bill or an amendment and make it general in its terms, but when a great Nation like the United States has assumed solemn treaty obligations I think those treaty obligations should be provided for in every act of legislation by which American sovereignty is relinquished over the islands.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President, there is no question but that those rights ought to be guaranteed, and there is no doubt in my mind that the President will require that guaranty. You can not specify in an amendment or in a bill every detail and every step necessary. We know that any President will want to protect not only citizens of the United States but citizens of any foreign country. So, even if there was no guaranty or any expression whatever, I have not any doubt that, in the interest of the Filipinos themselves, protection would be extended to them.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. The trouble is the Senator forgets that the Senator from Arkansas in this amendment has undertaken to specify the things that the President shall require of a new Philippine government, and he has omitted the very treaty obligation that we are solemnly bound to perform.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. The Senator need not take any more time on that, if he is willing to be satisfied with the suggestion I now make, and that is to add, after the words "United States," in line 3, page 3, the words "and others," so as to read "and safeguard all of the personal and property rights of citizens or corporations of the United States or others resident or engaged in business in said Philippines or having property interests therein."

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I think it should be more specific than that, because our guaranties to Spain are more specific than that.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. We do not need to duplicate it in a statute.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. We did in the statute we passed relating to Cuba give very specific and elaborate directions to the constitutional convention of Cuba. Those directions were sent direct to that constitutional convention, and it was required to place them in the constitution which the Cuban people adopted.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. No; but we did not require the Cuban people to assume to pay the debts Spain had contracted on behalf of Cuba. We left that saddled on Spain, and she has had to pay it.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. We did whatever we were under any treaty obligations to do. That is all there is in this case.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. I do not want to mix in this transaction any idea that we have got to ask the consent of anybody to do anything we want to do. We have a treaty obligation with Spain and we will meet it according to its spirit and meaning. We do not want to have our hands tied so that we can not legislate according to the powers of Congress, simply because some imaginary difficulty will hereafter arise with some other country.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Let me read some of the obligations we took to Spain in the treaty of Paris:

Spanish subjects, natives of the peninsula, residing in the Territory over which Spain by the present treaty relinquishes or cedes her sovereignty, may remain in such Territory or may remove therefrom, retaining in either event all their rights of property, including the right to sell or dispose of such property or of its proceeds; and they shall also have the right to carry on their industry, commerce, and professions, being subject in respect thereof to such laws as are applicable to other foreigners.

Is it proper in our act permitting the President to make a treaty with the new government of the Philippine Islands to simply guarantee Americans in their rights and fail to guarantee the rights of Spaniards and other foreigners?

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. The Senator is a lawyer and he understands that the document from which he is reading speaks of the obligation of one party to it to another. There is not any limitation upon the power of the United States to get out of the islands and turn that government over to another government. It is simply a stipulation that the United States will not deny any of the things granted there. If, when the Philippine Islands become an independent republic, it is violating any of those regulations or stipulations it will then be the proper occasion for Spain to make representations to the Philippine Islands and have them corrected in the usual way.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. The Philippine people can only become an independent people by the consent of the United States, and we, in giving that consent, should make it a condition that they shall carry out and observe to the letter all the solemn obligations we took to Spain.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. Then they are not independent. The very idea of independence is the privilege of doing wrong if you want to do it, subject to your responsibility. To stay there and say that the Philippines shall carry out every contract we ever made would not be to grant them independence.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Article 10—

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Yes.

Mr. CUMMINS. It seems to me the Senator from Nebraska has now reached a very interesting point. His argument inevitably leads to the conclusion that we must ask the consent of Spain before we leave the islands.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Not at all.

Mr. CUMMINS. Suppose Spain should say we are willing to take the obligation of the United States that these things should be done, but we are entirely unwilling to take the obligation of the government in the Philippine Islands.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Not at all. We shall simply, in relinquishing the sovereignty which we got from Spain, relinquish it upon the condition that the power to which we relinquish it shall carry out the obligations which we assumed. We did in Cuba exactly that thing. We required the new Cuban Government to undertake the same obligations. For instance, here is another article in the treaty of Paris:

The inhabitants of the territory over which Spain relinquishes or cedes her sovereignty shall be secured in the free exercise of their religion.

Suppose a new government set up there should undertake to interfere with that; we would have put that new government into existence, and before we put it into existence we should obligate it to carry out exactly the obligations which we had assumed.

Mr. HARDWICK. If the Senator will yield for just one moment, I wish to ask, suppose we kept up that and the new government went along and did those things anyhow, how could we be held responsible for it?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Because we had created it; we have an absolute sovereignty there at the present time, an unquestioned sovereignty.

Mr. HARDWICK. In other words, then, we would have no right to leave them?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. We would have the right to leave them if we required them to sign an obligation to make good the promises we had made.

Mr. HARDWICK. Then, suppose they did not?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Then, we would have the power to enforce it; but if we go out of there without making them assume that obligation, we shall have no power to enforce it.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Would the Senator agree to the amendment if there should be inserted in it language to the effect that we shall require that all the obligations that the United States Government has agreed to with Spain shall be agreed to by the Philippine people?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. That would make the amendment a great deal better, and it may be that I should be brought to the point of supporting it, but I certainly can not support it in its present shape. That is only one of the criticisms I have to make of it.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Yes.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I sympathize with a great deal that the Senator from Nebraska has said, but I should like to know whether I understand him correctly to say that when the United States shall part with the Philippine Islands, surrender all its sovereignty over the islands, and when an independent government shall be set up by the Filipino people, the United States will be still bound to see that the stipulations of the treaty entered into between the United States and Spain are carried out by the government of the Philippine Islands? Is that the position of the Senator?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Well, my position is that we ought at least to make them promise to observe our obligations.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. The question is whether we would be bound. If that is true, it is rather an unfortunate condition. The Senator, if I understand him, would try—

Mr. HITCHCOCK. They may violate American rights there, and there may come a question whether we shall step in and protect American rights; but we certainly owe to them as much obligation to carry out these treaty promises as we do to American citizens who have gone in there under our flag, and we can not in honor dodge those obligations.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Mr. President, if the Senator will bear with me, this treaty between ourselves and Spain is binding upon the Governments of those two countries; and when we leave the Philippines, whether we surrender them to the people of the islands themselves or whether we turn them over to some other country, whatever we may do with them when we finally leave them and surrender our sovereignty, our responsibility to Spain under the treaty has entirely ended. Those stipulations are not in the nature of covenants running with the land, and they are not covenants that bind us after we have parted with the land, as it seems to me.

Mr. McCUMBER. But the responsibility of the Filipinos continues.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. The Senator from North Dakota suggests that the responsibility of the Filipinos continues. It does not as to this treaty, because the treaty was not made between the Filipinos and Spain.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. We secured the sovereignty over the Philippines by treaty with the power that had that sovereignty, and in making that treaty we entered into certain obligations with respect to the Spanish citizens of that country. I can not conceive that the Senator from Utah would be willing to turn them over to a comparatively irresponsible power, without making the stipulation that our promises should be carried out. The Spaniards are still there; the business still continues. Would the Senator omit that from the amendment, and thus invite the new Philippine government to discriminate against those Spaniards?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. That is another proposition.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. It is the same proposition.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. No.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. It is only the other side of it.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. No. I think, when we come to sever our relations, that we ought to protect other countries as much as we can; but, after all, we do it not as a matter of obligation, not as a matter of treaty responsibility, but purely as a matter of comity.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I yield.

Mr. CUMMINS. May I ask the Senator from Nebraska a question?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Certainly.

Mr. CUMMINS. Suppose that the Filipino people did not want the Spaniards, or their kind, to live in the country at all, and that the policy of the Philippine government, about to be established, were that all such aliens should leave the country; would our right to liberate them or to allow them to become independent depend upon securing from Spain consent to that policy?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I am not endeavoring to secure anything from Spain; I am endeavoring, as a condition of the recognition of a new government, to say to that new government, "You must carry out the obligations which we were bound to carry out while we were in the islands."

Mr. CUMMINS. Then, the Senator believes that any new government, the independent government, sought to be established in the Philippine Islands should be bound by all the obligations that the United States has undertaken?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Yes; with relation to that country.

Mr. CUMMINS. With relation to anything?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. No; not with relation to anything; but with relation to matters under that new government and under that new sovereignty.

Mr. CUMMINS. And that we are not at liberty to surrender our sovereignty there unless the people of the Philippines are willing to undertake those obligations?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I think so.

Mr. CUMMINS. That necessarily, of course, involves the further suggestion made by the Senator from Utah [Mr. SUTHERLAND], that if the Philippine government should disregard these obligations, we would be bound to enforce them or be responsible to the government to which they were given.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. As to our responsibility to the other governments I am not undertaking to say. I am, however, undertaking to say that we should not put this power into new hands without requiring them to exercise it as we were bound to exercise it.

Mr. CUMMINS. If that is true, the independence of the Filipino is a dream, and never can be accomplished.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Well, is the independence of the Filipino a dream if we require him to protect American rights and interests there?

Mr. CUMMINS. Certainly, it is a dream.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I can not see that it is any more a dream when we are required to protect American rights than when we require them to protect Spanish rights, which we have agreed to protect.

Mr. CUMMINS. I suppose we have the right—I am sure we have—to insist upon a certain constitution or plan of government before we surrender our sovereignty.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I think so.

Mr. CUMMINS. That we have a right to do, or we should maintain our possession of the islands; but when that is done, then the Filipino people stand independent before the world; and if we can not escape the consequence of anything which the Filipino government might thereafter do, I, for one, do not want to see them independent. If we have to be responsible for their conduct, I would rather administer their government.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I am not seeking to assume responsibility for them; I am seeking to exact a promise from them that they shall, in taking over the government, also take over the promises which we have made.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, I am not disputing the advisability of requiring that; but the reason which the Senator from Nebraska gives for requiring these promises is that we are held to Spain and must answer to Spain for this obligation, and I entirely dissent from the Senator in believing that we have any such obligation toward Spain.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. If the Senator agrees with my proposition, I, of course, am not particularly disappointed that he criticizes my reasoning; that may not be correctly stated; but certainly some provision of this sort, recognizing the treaty obligations of the United States, should be put into the amendment if it is to be solemnly enacted into law.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, I may say there, if the Senator from Nebraska will allow me, that, in my opinion, he has not touched the gravest objection to the amendment.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I have not yet finished.

Mr. CUMMINS. He is possibly passing the point I have in mind. The United States, in this amendment, does not reserve the right to exercise, nor does it have any opportunity to exercise, any discretion over the plan of government which the Filipino people are expected to establish.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I am coming to that. Now, I want to call attention to what there is in the Philippine Islands. Besides our army of 12,000 Americans and 1,000 marines, there are 2,000 Americans in the civilian employ of the government, and a civilian population engaged in business of 8,500. There are 6,500 white Europeans, probably the larger portion of whom are Spaniards, but included in the number are English, Germans, Swedes, Swiss, Danes, Russians, and other nationalities. They all have business interests; they all have investments; many of them have gone in there under the protection of the American flag. Are we to pull out and leave those islands without asking the new government to protect the lives of those people and to guarantee their interests the same as American rights and interests are protected and guaranteed? Yet the amendment as proposed by the Senator from Arkansas would leave that unsaid, would leave the new government entirely capable of discriminating against those people.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. Will the Senator permit me to make one observation in that connection?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. With pleasure.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. In delegating authority to a responsible source, it is always the preferable plan to delegate it in very general terms. It is a principle of law that enumeration will weaken in the delegation of authority, because when you go out to deal with subjects outside of the text they must be of the same general class under the doctrine of ejusdem generis. In writing this amendment I kept that principle in view, and provided that—

the President is hereby invested with full power and authority to make such orders and regulations and to enter into such negotiations with the authorities of said Philippines.

If the United States stands in the attitude of an indorser of any pledge that has been made to Spain that affects its relations with the Philippine Islands, of course under existing provisions of law the President would have a right to take that into consideration; and, as the Senator from Iowa properly says, in any government that they set up there there must be, or there should be—and there will be—a provision made for respecting in good faith the rights of everybody who would be affected, remotely or otherwise, by the change of sovereignty that takes place. It is not to be assumed that the President is seeking to do anything he should not do, to run away and leave the obligations of the United States unprotected. He is to settle and adjust the matter finally, and upon the high plane on which a great Government like this will deal with all of its obligations; and the assumption is that they will be dealt with justly and honorably. That is so obviously so that every fair-minded man must admit that the settlement will be made on that basis.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I am aware that the Senator has drawn his amendment in very general terms; that is what I am criticizing. I say that, according to the precedent in the case of Cuba, this amendment should be so drawn as to specifically include the things that we know the new government of the Philippines should recognize; and it should not specify American rights any more than it should specify other rights guaranteed by the treaty, and for which we are morally responsible.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Would this suggestion meet the views of the Senator, by inserting after the words "United States" the words "and of other countries," so that it would read:

And to cause to be acknowledged, respected, and safeguarded all of the personal and property rights of citizens or corporations of the United States and of other countries resident or engaged in business in said Philippines or having property interests therein.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I think that would improve the amendment a great deal; but, as the Senator from Arkansas has himself stated, the amendment is somewhat of a patchwork already, and, in my opinion, it should be redrafted.

Now, Mr. President, I want to call attention to the next matter of which I have made a note here, and that is an amendment which the Senator from Arkansas has already indicated he may accept. He provides in his amendment that immediately after the passage of this act the President shall undertake to enter into negotiations with other countries for the neutralization of the Philippine Islands.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. I have no objection to that being stricken out.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I understand. I can not imagine a worse time than the present for the United States to undertake to enter into negotiations with other countries for a joint guaranty of the independence of the Philippine Islands or for anything else. We know that with most of the nations at war it would be absolutely impossible at the present time to initiate, much less secure, such an agreement, and I think that should be left wholly within the discretion of the President of the United States.

Mr. President, I concede that it would be very difficult, even in times of peace, to secure from the nations of the world a guaranty of the neutrality of the Philippine Islands when the matter is left in the condition it will be left in if this amendment is adopted. Guarantee the independence of what? Of a nation that has not come into being? Guarantee the independence of the Philippine Islands when the next Congress or the Congress after or the Congress four years from now may not grant it? Guarantee the independence of the Philippine Islands when the President by his proclamation has power to continue American control for another year? I think that that is a matter which the President should not take up until it has been definitely arranged that the new government is to go into existence and exactly what it is to be. It is going to be hard enough in any event to secure joint action from the great nations of the world to guarantee the independence of the Philippine Islands.

Do Senators think, for instance, that it will be easy to secure a guaranty of the independence of the Philippine Islands from Great Britain—Great Britain that has three or four million Malay subjects within a few hundred miles of the Philippine Islands; Great Britain that is exercising dominion over a number of different races of the world with whom she is having trouble in maintaining her sovereignty at times? I doubt very much whether the British Empire will undertake to guarantee the independence of a Malay republic or any other republic in the Orient, because it will simply add to the agitation among her own people. I might continue the illustration by mentioning other nations. I think the securing of an international guaranty is a very difficult matter, and is certainly not one which should be undertaken at this time when the world is aflame with war.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President, does the Senator think that there would be any difficulty in getting Great Britain or any of the other nations to assert, as they did assert in the case of the independence of Hawaii, that they would respect the possessions of the Philippines and would not attempt by the extension of suzerainty or in any other way to exercise jurisdiction or control over them?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. A joint guaranty of that kind involves representatives of those countries meeting together and discussing it; and it is not within the possibilities this year or possibly next year or the year after next to get such representatives together. This is the most inopportune time that could possibly have been selected.

Mr. SHAFROTH. I agree with the Senator that the word "immediately" ought to be stricken out. I do not believe that it is a very opportune time right now; but, at the same time, I believe that we could get an agreement with other nations to respect the territorial possessions of the new Philippine Government.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Colorado, with the permission of the Senator from Nebraska, a question in connection with what has just been said?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. TOWNSEND. What would the Senator from Colorado do in case they made an agreement and did not respect the agreement?

Mr. SHAFROTH. I believe that we would have to rely very largely upon the good faith and honesty of the nations. Sometimes when there is great stress and the motives are strong agreements may be violated; but I do not believe, in the absence of any such condition, that there will be any difficulty. Those conditions do not seem to be applicable to this case; but, in any event, at the end of the five-year period our responsibility would be ended and we could do what we pleased at that time.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Does the Senator believe, or can he conceive, that it would be possible to involve the United States in war over that proposition?

Mr. SHAFROTH. No; I think not. Our responsibility now might involve us in war, if it were attempted to do something in contravention of our rights; in fact, I think it unquestionably would; but we are now proposing a lessening of our responsibilities, and it seems to me that we ought to try to bring about the best possible conditions. The difficulty with this situation is this—

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Will the Senator permit me to finish? I have only a little more to say.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Very well. I merely wanted to amplify my suggestion.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, I come to the provision which requires the President to recognize any stable government that may be set up. We required the people of Cuba to do something more than that; we required the people of Cuba to erect a republican form of government.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas. And the Cubans were within 100 miles of our own shores, while the Philippine people are 7,000

miles away in a locality where republics are not very fashionable.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. That is true, Mr. President; but it is also true that this great Nation has spent tens of millions of dollars in the attempt to erect a republican form of government in the Philippine Islands, and I tell you that any party which would take the responsibility of destroying a republican form of government and permitting the creation of an autocracy where the seeds of freedom have once been planted, will be repudiated by the American people. While we are requiring the people of the Philippine Islands to erect a stable government, it is just as easy to say that they shall have a government republican in form. That is the idea that the United States stands for; that is already an idea that will be welcomed by the Philippine people. We should not permit a limited class of the Filipinos to erect a monarchical form of government or an autocracy; we should at the time we are relinquishing our sovereignty over the Philippine Islands give to the people of those islands at least the protection of requiring the new government to be republican in form.

Moreover, Mr. President, we should require that this new government should be established by peaceful means. There is nothing in the pending amendment that would prevent the new Philippine government from being established by a bloody revolution, so when we are relinquishing our authority in the Philippine Islands, we should lay down also as a condition of recognition that the new government shall be republican in form, and that it shall be established by peaceful means. I think, as I have already said, that the American people will hold any party responsible in this country that fails at least to do that much for the Philippine people when they are turned loose, as the phrase goes, on the great unknown sea of self-government.

Mr. President, I have said this much by way of criticism or analysis of this amendment. I am sorry that it has been introduced. I think that the bill which was presented by the committee had been carefully drawn and carefully digested. I believe it would have received the support not only of the Senators on this side of the Chamber but of a very large number of Senators on the other side of the Chamber. I believe it would have settled the Philippine question, and settled it in a nonpartisan way. I know the Philippine people were satisfied with it. I know that they thought that the first great step toward independence would have been taken by its passage. That bill, if passed, would not only give them their own legislature but the control of almost all of their public officials, the control of taxation, and it would have given them the solemn promise of the Congress of the United States that they were to become an independent nation. It would have been satisfactory; and we could have, with confidence, left to other Congresses the carrying out of the promise made, and, with confidence, we could have left it to the Philippine people that they would work up toward the ideal of self-government in the hope of receiving all the earlier the final act of legislation which would give them their independence. I had hoped that the bill might pass in that form. I believe if it could have remained in that form it would have been passed readily, but this amendment is here, and I present to-day these criticisms of it.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Nebraska a question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. POMERENE in the chair). Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I do.

Mr. SHAFROTH. I should like to ask the Senator if he does not remember that in the course of the colloquy which occurred during my remarks on the pending bill the principal criticisms made by various Senators upon the other side of the Chamber were as to the indefiniteness of the promise, and that Senator after Senator rose and said that there ought to be a more definite promise of independence; that discord would be produced unless the Filipinos were given some such assurance? The preamble, as it existed in the bill, instead of satisfying Senators upon the Republican side of the Chamber, seemed to create a storm of discord over there.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I remember some discussion of that kind.

Mr. President, before I sit down I want to come to the last point of criticism. The amendment of the Senator from Arkansas closes with a direction to the President, or with authority given to the President, to give the guaranty on behalf of the United States alone for the protection of the independence of the Philippine Islands in case the President is not able to secure the cooperation of other countries. Now, Mr. President, I, for one, am not willing at this time to enter into that obligation. The time may come after the establishment of a

Philippine government, after we know what they are going to do, when I shall be willing to empower the President of the United States with authority to give that guaranty; but, Mr. President, I think it is altogether too large an obligation for this Government to assume so long in advance. I know that for the United States to guarantee the independence of the Philippine Islands even for five years after the expiration of the four-year period will be as serious an obligation as any we are incurring now in the control of the islands. I know it will cost as much money, and I know it will involve a great many more dangers and complications; and when the proper time comes, if the Senator from Arkansas insists on his amendment in its present form, I shall move to strike out at least that part of the amendment.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, before the Senator takes his seat, I should like some expression of his views as to the propriety of our maintaining a naval base and a coaling station in the Philippines, with the complete independence of the islands.

Suppose that we should give the islands independence, and that they should grant to us a coaling station or naval base, and immediately after obtaining their independence they should proceed to grant the same kind of rights to Japan, or to Great Britain, or to Germany. What would our attitude be, and what authority would we have to exercise over those islands in order to protect our own naval base?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, I think the Senator raises a very serious question; and it is a question that I, for one, think the present Congress should not undertake to meet. It is not in the original bill. It comes up only as a part of this amendment. There seems to be a general sentiment that when we recognize the independence of the Philippine Islands we should perhaps retain a naval base and a coaling station, or some other property rights or privileges of that sort. That, however, is a question for the future, and in my opinion it is one that this Congress ought not to attempt to settle.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Nebraska whether the hearings developed the value of the island of Batun, which is a small island southeast of Luzon, as a naval base?

I recall that when I was a member of the Committee on the Philippines the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] proposed some measure for the development of that island because of the large measures of coal there. During the discussion it was developed that the island was almost uninhabited; that these coal measures existed; that there was a fairly good harbor upon the island; and that if we should at some time determine to cut loose from the Philippines Batun Island, on account of its lack of complications as to population and its separation from the main islands, would make an excellent naval base and commercial station for the United States, somewhat resembling Hongkong, which, as the Senator will recollect, is an island detached from the mainland of China. Can the Senator give me any information upon that subject?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, I am not able to do so, because our committee gave very little of its time to the consideration of military or naval questions or policies. We were engaged in the effort to frame a bill that would extend a measure of self-government to the Philippine people, with the promise of ultimate independence. We were expecting to leave to future Congresses the decision of the important question whether the independence of the new government, when recognized, should be guaranteed; and we were not supposed to take into account the values of the various islands for those purposes. I have no doubt the Senator is better informed on that subject than I am.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Mr. President, for that reason it seems to me it might be well to postpone final action upon this bill until a later day, some time in this session, meanwhile giving the Committee on the Philippine Islands an opportunity of fully investigating the questions that are covered by the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas. It is very clear, as the Senator from Nebraska has stated, that this committee confined itself entirely to the question of giving the Filipinos a larger share in their government, and not to the question as to the preparations that might be made for finally cutting loose from those islands.

It now seems to be the opinion of the Senate, from the expressions which I have thus far heard—an opinion in which I share—that we ought now to determine decisively, so far as we can, the relation of those islands to this country. In that view a very important inquiry remains yet to be developed by the Committee on the Philippines, and that is, what preparations are to be made by the United States with a view to shaping gradually the separation of those islands from this country.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President—
The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nevada yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. NEWLANDS. If the Senator will permit me, I will conclude in a moment.

My own view was as I expressed it in 1906, after my return from a trip to the Philippine Islands with Mr. Taft and his party, that we should prepare for that separation within a period of 20 years, and that we should address ourselves with the greatest vigor to giving the Filipino people a common language, appropriating money directly from the United States Treasury if necessary in order to accomplish that purpose. It is perfectly evident that out of a total insular revenue of only \$11,000,000, or with the municipal revenues added, only \$17,000,000, they could not assign to educational purposes more than the \$2,000,000 then annually appropriated, and that was sufficient to take care of only one-fourth of the children of the islands.

I also contended during that time that we should teach the Filipino people how to work, and therefore industrial training was essential; and that industrial training necessarily meant not only industrial schools but an agricultural bank that would aid the Filipino farmer to get the improved instruments of production and to use them. At that time they were using the forked stick instead of the plow. I urged that an appropriation should be made, if necessary, by the United States Government for the establishment of such a Filipino bank, with a capital of at least \$10,000,000.

I also urged that it was essential that we should untie those islands so far as their tariff relations with the United States were concerned; that if we looked to a thoroughly individualized life for the Philippine Islands that meant an uncomplicated fiscal and tariff system of their own eventually, and that we should not by a favored tariff system, giving their products favor in our markets and our products favor in theirs, create a condition of mutual subsidy which it would be hard to undo, and which if undone abruptly at some future time would involve those islands in industrial and commercial complications that would bring about depression in business, unemployment, and want, and as a necessary result revolution itself, which would entirely undo the good work which we had accomplished.

All these things, it seems to me, ought to be looked after in any rational preparation for parting with those islands. Whilst I am in favor of parting with them as soon as possible, I want to part with them as creditably as possible. It seems to me that the Senate could well defer its final action upon all the amendments to this bill for a period of a month or six weeks or two months, fixing a certain day for their consideration, and that meanwhile the Committee on the Philippine Islands could address itself to these questions which it has not thus far considered, and present to us a complete scheme of gradual withdrawal from the islands.

If the suggestion which I then made had been carried out, they would have been much better prepared for separation than they are now, for my suggestion involved securing to the Philippines a thoroughly individualized life, with their own fiscal and tariff system entirely uncomplicated with our own, the only connecting link between the islands and our own being the commission itself, which constituted the higher legislative body of those islands. Later on, if a native legislative body were substituted for this, they would be prepared to carry on an individualized life after a president or an executive of that republic were selected in the place of the Governor General whom we have there.

These complications exist. We do not know what naval bases we want, if any. We do not know what commercial stations we want, if any. We hardly know to-day what our tariff relations are with those islands. We do not know to-day what our complications are as to trade. We hardly know to-day what our complications are with those islands as to our navigation laws. We have undoubtedly, both in Cuba and in the Philippine Islands, built up favored conditions of trade for this country under which we have ousted the trade of other countries hitherto enjoying trade with those islands and substituted our own; and we are now about to give the Philippine Islands a separate existence.

This question of complicated trade relations is a very important one. I do not wish to see this country enter upon the decision of a great economic question without preparation. We have been accustomed to play with economic questions in the gayest of ways, un mindful of the disruptions in business, in trading conditions, of unemployment and want, created by our action. I should like to see the great American Nation finish this great job, this altruistic job, that it has started out to perform, with a proper regard not simply for vague principles of

liberty and independence but with a proper regard for the substantial economic welfare of the Filipino people.

Mr. President, with the permission of the Senate, I should like to insert in the RECORD the whole or portions of two magazine articles, one in the North American Review and the other in the Independent, written in the years 1905 and 1906, respectively, after my return from the Philippines, and at a time when I was a member, I think, of the Philippine Committee, and when these questions of tariff adjustments were under consideration. These articles contain much that is applicable at the present time regarding the policy of gradual separation from the Philippines, although the forecast regarding possible importations of sugar from the islands has not been fully realized.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? If not, it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

A DEMOCRAT IN THE PHILIPPINES.

[Article from the North American Review of December, 1905, by Francis G. Newlands, United States Senator from Nevada.]

When Secretary Taft invited me to accompany him on his trip to the Philippines I hesitated. I had been opposed from the start to the acquisition of the islands. On the day following Dewey's victory I had personally urged President McKinley to order his fleet to Cuba, insisting that the purpose of the war was not to conquer the Philippines, but to free Cuba, upon whose soil we had not yet landed a soldier. After Spain passed her scant title to us, I had urged that we should hold the islands in trust for the Filipino people, that we should make an immediate declaration of our purpose to grant them independence, and that we should take steps to quickly accomplish this purpose.

I had no illusions regarding the Filipino people. I did not believe them fitted for democratic methods of government, nor that they could quickly develop into a homogeneous people, or act with unity of purpose. I thought it probable that, if we left them to themselves, there would be civil war and continued disorder until some foreign power should intervene, or one race should gain the mastery over the others, or the leadership of some masterful man should result in military dictatorship.

While these consequences might be deplorable, I did not deem it our duty to attempt to avert them by subjugating the numerous races of the archipelago. If the Filipino people were to be killed, it were better that they should kill each other than that we should kill them; or if they were to be conquered by a foreign power, that some other country should undertake the destructive task. Besides, I believe that the proper evolution of the Filipino people was not to be accomplished through subjection to an alien people, but through the slow process of self-development by which nations have risen to strength and power.

I was concerned more for our own people and institutions than for the Filipino people or their institutions. I felt that a great nation, established for the first time in the history of the world upon the basic principle that just government rests upon the consent of the governed, and that taxation and representation are inseparable, should not qualify ideals which had advanced democratic institutions everywhere. I felt that our institutions were endangered by an intense commercialism, which had lowered the standards of municipal, State, and national life, and that our concern should be to save democracy at home rather than to promote imperialism abroad.

Such were my views regarding the Philippines, but the country had in two campaigns decided that the Philippines should be retained. While my views had not changed, I felt the futility of further contention, and feared that a trip to the Philippines would simply be a waste of time.

But I also recognized the fact that the two parties, as represented by their leaders, Roosevelt and Bryan, did not stand far apart. Bryan from the start had insisted that there should be an immediate declaration of our purpose to grant independence to the Filipinos. Roosevelt, in a recent message, had declared that it was his firm belief that the United States could help the Filipinos to rise higher and higher in the scale of civilization and capacity for self-government, and that it was his earnest hope that in the end they would be able to stand, if not entirely alone, yet in some such relation to the United States as that in which Cuba now stands.

It was clear, therefore, that the best men of both parties were now intent upon solving the question in a manner consistent with the theory and the traditions of our Government.

The most potent factor in this dispassionate view of the question had been Judge Taft, whose fixed determination to conduct the government of the Philippines in the interest of the Filipino people as a sacred trust, uncontrolled by selfish considerations, had aroused the moral sentiment and challenged the admiration of the country. I felt that the invitation of such a man to members of the opposite party to accompany him upon his proposed trip of inspection, affording, as it did, opportunity for nonpartisan consideration of the Philippine question, was not to be lightly regarded, and I concluded to accept the invitation.

THE FILIPINO PEOPLE.

At almost every city and town we visited we were entertained by processions representing the army, the native scouts and constabulary, the various industries and the schools, as well as by banquets in which leading Filipinos participated. We also had hearings of those interested in the various agricultural and business pursuits and those who had suggestions and complaints to make regarding existing political conditions. From my observations and inquiry, I should say that the Filipinos are an interesting people and capable of much development. The children learn English with great facility and there seems to be a general desire among all classes for education, the night schools being crowded by those who are occupied during the day. The total population is about 7,000,000. The number of children of school age (7 to 15) is over 2,000,000, of whom only about one-sixth are enrolled. I was told that there was much eagerness to attend the schools, but that insufficiency of funds prevented the increase of the enrollment.

We listened to the Filipino leaders at banquets and public meetings. They had, as a rule, pleasing voices, of a vibrant tone that appealed to the emotions, and I have no doubt that they would be very potent in influencing the masses of their people. They carried themselves with dignity and self-control. They showed much familiarity with our struggle for independence, and spoke persuasively, earnestly, and eloquently regarding the aspirations of their people for independence. But it was

not apparent that they had much conception of the individual rights and the fundamental liberties which independence should secure. It is impossible that they could have. The educated class constitutes a very small percentage of the population. Most of them had been trained under the Spanish government of dishonesty and graft, in which almost every official was the oppressor, certainly not the servant, of the people, and under which the peasants, constituting about 90 per cent of the population, were exploited by the official and influential classes, both Spanish and Filipinos. These peasants are said to be patient, submissive, easily influenced and easily led. Under the influence of their leaders, the patient agricultural peasants of to-day become the larders or the fanatical puljanos or the patriotic insurgents, or all combined, of to-morrow. They have been accustomed to the orinetal system, represented by rulers such as sultans, datos and caciques, headmen who direct the energies of their people, and to whose will the peasant class is subject.

That the peasants also desire independence can not be doubted. They would prefer to be led and governed by their own leaders, even though the latter have in view their industrial subjection. I am satisfied, from what I have seen and heard in the Philippines, that there can be no permanent friendliness between the Filipinos and the Americans. The Filipino people, as a rule, wish a national life, even though most of them have no real conception of what liberty means.

The islands were not quiet. A long and expensive campaign had been waged in Cavite against the larders, necessitating martial law and the reconcentration of the natives, who were disposed to shelter and protect them.

Samar had been in confusion as the result of the outbreak of the puljanos or "red breeches," the mountain people of that island, in an insurrectionary movement, half religious and fanatical and half protest against the native officials, who, though elected under American administration, thought their offices justified Spanish and Oriental extortion and oppression. All these movements taxed to the full the strength of the scouts and the constabulary forces.

PRESENT CONDITIONS IN THE PHILIPPINES.

In contrast with the beautiful appearance of the islands was the doleful story of the people. Added to the ravages of the civil war with Spain, and of our war of conquest, were the disasters caused by cholera, rinderpest, surra, the locusts, and typhoons. The agricultural depression was great. The sugar plantations were without modern machinery and modern methods, and it was impossible to borrow money for their renovation. And yet, notwithstanding these untoward conditions, the apparent contradiction of an increase in wages also existed and it was difficult to get laborers for agricultural industries. This was accounted for by the statement that the movements of the military forces and the public works had withdrawn the laborers from the farms. Indisposition to work was also complained of. The increase in wages enabled the natives to secure by one day's labor what used to require two. The result was that the laborer, having earned in one or two days enough to secure a week's supply of rice, would lie off until the pressure of hunger again drove him to work.

THE INSULAR COMMISSION.

The Philippine Commission is conscientiously working out the problems of good government, with a single eye to the prosperity and advancement of the Filipino people. It is not yet a government of the people or by the people, but it is preeminently a government for the people, and its purpose is to instruct the people, and particularly the peasant class, so as to give them a realization of what justice, individual rights, and civil responsibility mean.

Believing that a common language and the creation of a public opinion are essential to self-government, the Commission has prepared to make the universal language English. English is taught first by American teachers and later on by Filipino teachers, who have been instructed by them. The educational expenditure, insular, provincial, and municipal, is about \$2,000,000 gold annually. At least \$6,000,000 is required.

This educational system, of course, involves the danger that the educated child is likely to drift from manual labor, but the commission is wisely directing it in industrial channels by promoting agricultural and manual-training schools.

In addition to the requirements of education, money is also required for road building, for railroads, for harbor and municipal improvements, and for the development of the agricultural interests. The municipal and harbor improvements and road building have been covered by bond issues authorized at the last session, with interest, if I am right, at 5 per cent.

Congress recently authorized the construction of about 1,000 miles of railroad in the various islands by private corporations, involving a cost of about \$30,000,000, and the issue by them of bonds for such construction, with interest at 4 per cent, the interest to be guaranteed by the insular government. As the amount of the bonds will doubtless build the railroads, I urged in the Senate that we should authorize the insular government to build the railroads and to issue bonds therefor to the extent of \$30,000,000 at 2 per cent, with the guaranty of the United States as to both principal and interest. While not prepared to urge Government ownership at home, owing to the complexity of our Government and the difficulty of insuring businesslike methods of administration, I felt that Government ownership suited the necessarily paternal nature of the insular government and was merely in line with the policy now adopted as the result of experience with both State-aided and State-owned railroads in the British and Dutch East Indies and that the commission was a body of such capacity, integrity, experience, and administrative qualifications that it could easily undertake the work. The saving between 2 per cent, the rate of bonds so guaranteed by the United States, and the income which a private corporation would expect, would pay for the roads in 30 years, and a light cost of transportation would greatly lighten the burdens of the islands. I regret to say that the movement failed.

AGRICULTURAL BANK.

There is strong need of an agricultural bank, resembling those of Germany and Egypt, with a capital of at least \$10,000,000. It is impossible to expect such a bank to be organized by private capital when the condition is such as is described by the Manila Chamber of Commerce in these words:

"The country, generally speaking, is in a state of financial collapse. The agriculturists and merchants are passing through the worst crisis ever known in the annals of Filipino history. A series of calamities have contributed to bring the country to this deplorable state."

An agricultural bank could loan the money necessary to introduce improved methods, particularly on the sugar plantations. It could also aid in the development of the 400,000 acres of land purchased

from the friars, which are still on the hands of the insular government. Assisted by the bureau of agriculture, it could accomplish the development of the general agricultural interests of the islands upon a thoroughly modern and scientific basis. All moneys advanced could be properly secured upon the improvements made, and thus an insular agricultural bank, with a capital derived from the sale of insular bonds at 2 per cent, guaranteed by the United States, could do a business that would earn at least 6 per cent.

It will be economy for the United States to move generously and efficiently now. Economic distress may result in discontent that will cause outbreaks whose suppression will cost infinitely more than the aid at present needed. It must be remembered that the tropical islands have been languishing for years. The Temperate Zone has beaten the Tropical Zone in competition in sugar and tobacco. The outbreak of Cuba against Spain was largely due to economic distress caused by the low price of sugar. I think it likely that it has also had something to do with the contemporaneous discontent in the Philippines.

The insular revenues are now only about \$9,000,000 in gold, to which may be added \$3,000,000 in gold as the municipal revenues for Manila and \$2,000,000 in gold as the provincial and municipal revenues outside of Manila. Fourteen million dollars in gold is the sum that is now available annually for all purposes—insular, provincial, and municipal—in a government of 7,000,000 people. When we recall that the District of Columbia, with less than 300,000 people, requires about \$9,000,000 or \$10,000,000 annually for municipal and District purposes, it seems amazing that the Insular Commission should have accomplished so much with so little.

ABOLITION OF TARIFF DUTIES.

The main measure of relief for the Philippine Islands thus far urged is the abolition of American duties on Philippine products, to be followed, when the Spanish treaty expires three years hence, by the abolition of Philippine duties upon American products. Such a proposition involves the closed door in the Philippines at a time when we are strenuously urging the open door in China, Manchuria, and Korea. This is both wrong and impolitic; wrong because consistency is required of nations as well as individuals, and impolitic because it will give Japan and China an excuse for securing favored arrangements in the Orient which will exclude our products. If we get the monopoly of imports into the Philippines, it would not compensate for the losses which we would sustain in the rest of the Orient by the assertion of this policy. If we refuse equal opportunities for Japanese trade in the Philippines, how can we insist upon equal opportunities with Japan in Manchuria and Korea?

I am aware that this suggestion of free trade, or freer trade, appeals to many Democrats; but reflection, I think, should convince anyone that the arrangement, so far as the Philippine Islands are concerned, means restricted trade, not freer trade. At present the Philippine Islands have a tariff which conforms to the theory of a tariff for revenue only, so strenuously urged by many Democrats, for it imposes a duty of only 20 per cent upon importations from all countries, including the United States, without preference to any. It is now proposed that this tariff should be maintained as to all other countries, but be abolished as to the United States, the very purpose being to give the United States the monopoly of imports into the Philippines and to exclude the products of England, France, Germany, Spain, and other countries. Can this restricted trade be called free trade or freer trade? At best the proposed arrangement will be one of subsidy.

SUGAR SUBSIDY.

The tendency of our policy in the Tropics has been to destroy the revenue feature of the sugar tax by giving the tax as an additional price to the producers of sugar in the tropical islands. The world's price of raw sugar is about 2 cents per pound, or \$40 per ton; the price in America is \$75 per ton, because the customs duty of 1½ cents per pound, or \$35 per ton, is added. When, therefore, sugar is imported from the tropical islands duty free, it sells in our markets at the same price as the duty-paid sugar—\$75 per ton—and thus the tropical planter gets on the duty-free sugar, as a subsidy, the amount of the duty which the Treasury loses. Porto Rico, Cuba, and Hawaii send all their sugar to the United States, because the sugar of Porto Rico and Hawaii comes in duty free, and the Cuban sugar comes in with one-fourth of the duty, or about \$9 per ton, off. On their production the planters in these islands get in the United States markets the following amounts annually more than they can get anywhere else, and this constitutes the annual subsidy of these tropical islands:

Hawaii, 400,000 tons, duty free, \$35 per ton	\$14,000,000
Porto Rico, 100,000 tons, duty free, \$35 per ton	3,500,000
Cuba, 1,000,000 tons, one-fourth duty off, \$9 per ton	9,000,000

Total subsidy..... 26,500,000

The imports from Cuba are increasing, and it is claimed that during the coming season they will be 1,300,000 tons.

Under similar circumstances there is no reason why the Filipino planters should not restore their old maximum of 400,000 tons annually, on which a similar subsidy of \$35 per ton would amount to \$14,000,000 per annum above what they could receive in Hongkong or in any other sugar market except the United States.

If, as has been done in Cuba, under the influence of a smaller subsidy, the increase should be to 1,000,000 tons annually, the total subsidy of the Filipino planters would amount to \$35,000,000 annually, and the United States Treasury would suffer loss in that amount. In time, therefore, the sugar tax would lose its character as a revenue producer and would be turned into a subsidy for tropical islands.

POLITICAL COMPLICATIONS.

Important political difficulties are also likely to arise from complicating our revenue system with that of the Philippine Islands. The Philippine Islands are now almost entirely dependent upon customs duties for their revenue. If this plan of mutual subsidy goes through and the United States secures the monopoly of the Philippine markets, it necessarily follows that little or no revenue will come from the customs and that the Philippine Government will be compelled to substitute land and other internal taxes. Already it has taken measures to institute the land tax, and the protest is so loud and deep as to compel the postponement of its operation.

Again, I understand our purpose is to train the Filipino people in self-government, in the hope that ultimately they will be fitted for independence. If this be really our purpose, it would be very unwise to complicate the fiscal and revenue systems of the two countries; for, when separation comes, industrial disturbance may follow the

change in these fiscal and revenue relations. Our policy should be to hold the Philippines as an entity absolutely separate from the United States, the only connection between them being the civil government, which should gradually draw the Filipinos into participation until the time is ripe for independence. Then the United States can at any time declare its trust ended and turn over the government of the Philippines to its ward. It is an essential doctrine of equity that the trustee should not mingle his ward's property or interests with his own, and our government in the Philippines should be so administered as to enable our ward, when she comes to the maturity of her powers, to move among the nations in a thoroughly uncomplicated and individualized life. Would it not be uncandid, whilst professing a desire to fit the Filipino people for self-government and independence, to bind the two countries together, at the same time, so strongly by navigation laws and tariff legislation and commercial ties generally as to make it impossible to cut the political ties without a serious and perhaps fatal readjustment? If American capital secures the monopoly of ocean transportation between the islands and the United States, of interisland navigation, and of railroad transportation, and also the control of subsidized sugar planting, every selfish and commercial consideration will stand in the way of a moral settlement of this important question.

SUGGESTED LEGISLATION.

I would suggest, therefore, in place of the proposed reduction in duties the following legislation:

(1) The repeal of the act extending our coast navigation laws to the Philippine Islands. These will confessedly impose a higher burden on the transportation of her exports and imports than now. Their operation has already been postponed for a time by a recent act.

(2) If not too late, the repeal of the act authorizing insular aid for railroad building by the insular guaranty of 4 per cent interest on the \$30,000,000 of bonds, and the substitution of insular construction and ownership of the proposed railroads accomplished by means of an insular bond issue at 2 per cent guaranteed by the United States.

(3) The authorization of insular, provincial, and municipal bonds sufficient to cover needed permanent improvements, the bonds bearing interest at 2 per cent, thus facilitating the application of a larger portion of current revenues to education, particularly of an industrial character. The enrollment of the schools should be trebled.

(4) An issue of \$10,000,000 of bonds for an insular agricultural bank, the bonds to bear interest at 2 per cent and to be guaranteed by the United States; such bank to aid the introduction of machinery and improved methods in agriculture by secured loans to the farmers. All these bonds should run for 30 years, in which time the saving in interest should pay for them. The total, including railroads, would be about \$600,000,000, or, without railroads, \$30,000,000.

SEPARATION.

When the time comes for final determination of the relations of the Filipinos to us, a plebiscite can be taken. If separation is then desired by either, it can be accomplished. Meanwhile, the United States can largely center its own expenditures at Subig Bay, which, cut off by the mountains from the rest of Luzon, and having but few native occupants, can be made an easily defended naval, coaling, and commercial station for our Navy and merchant marine. When the time comes for separation, we can easily retain Subig Bay and thus make it a link in the chain of our naval and commercial administration.

If the bonds authorized by us are not by that time retired, and if the islanders can not bear the burden of debt contracted by our authority, we can pay it and cancel the obligation, thus adding a timely generosity to the hundreds of millions now irreclaimably lost in the military and naval expenses connected with our control of the Philippines.

This will be more businesslike, wiser, and cheaper than the proposed tariff subsidy, which within 40 years would probably turn over to the Filipino planters from \$300,000,000 to \$600,000,000 in sugar subsidies paid by the American consumers in an unjust tax diverted from the United States Treasury. The islands will then be on a healthy and uncomplicated basis, instead of on a stimulated and complicated basis which will make the nursing bottle of subsidy essential to their existence.

I have not the space to enter into the consideration of the strategic mistake of having possessions occupied by unwilling subjects so far removed from our base—impossible of defense should the time come in the Orient when we may be beset by foes outside the islands and by insurgents within, or of the great military expense entailed by holding them as an asset instead of a trust.

The fact is that, prior to the war, if Spain had offered them to us, we would have refused. Dewey's victory happened to be in Manila Bay instead of in the open sea. Shall we, therefore, permit ourselves to remain always under the tyranny of an accident?

But far above these practical considerations are the moral considerations for which Roosevelt, Bryan, and Taft stand as representatives of true democracy, which has not yet lost faith in government of the people, for the people, and by the people. We can not check the aspiration for independence in the Philippines when such advocates of political morality in both parties voice it in the United States. Separation will some day come. Let us intelligently prepare for it.

THE RIGHT WAY TO HELP THE FILIPINOS.

[An article from the Independent of Mar. 8, 1906, by FRANCIS G. NEWLANDS.]

(Senator NEWLANDS, of Nevada, was a member of the Taft party, which visited Japan and the Philippines last summer, and on this account as well as because of his special study of Philippine affairs, he is an authority in Congress and the country on the islands.—Editor.)

It is easy enough to theorize and criticize, but before we can practically and impartially discuss the Philippine situation and develop the right way to help the Filipinos, two primal questions must be answered without partisan prejudice, to wit, What do we want of the Philippines? and, What do the Filipinos want?

In one word, the Filipinos want independence. This is true of the Filipinos almost without exception, from the highest to the lowest, from the richest to the poorest, from the most intelligent to the most ignorant.

What we want of the Philippines is harder to answer, because, in the past, at least, according to our conditions, we have wanted various conflicting things; but a process of elimination has been going on as our eyes have been opened by time and experience.

Some were controlled by commercial sentiment. They wanted to make money out of the Philippines, but they are now realizing that no money is to be made. This is the class that is now clamorous for

Chinese labor and for an American tariff subsidy to Filipino production, to be guided and controlled by American exploiters.

The convictions of some have been guided by religious sentiment, but they have discovered that the Filipinos are already at least a nominally Christian people, under the guidance of the Roman Catholic Church.

Some have been controlled by military spirit. Conquest and expansion has been their cry. Now they realize that there is no glory in conquering the Philippines, and that the military expense connected with the retention of the islands has been and will continue to be enormous.

Some claimed that we had acquired a commercial base in the Orient and that the Philippines would be a connecting link in our trade with China and Japan. They now realize that this trade, via the Philippines, must take two sides of a triangle instead of one, and that the idea of making the Philippines a base of trade with China and Japan is as absurd as for England to make Jamaica the base of her trade with the United States.

But the controlling factor in our sentiment toward the islands has undoubtedly been that the Filipinos were unable to take care of the Philippines, and that we owed a duty both to the people there and to civilization which compelled us, for a time at least, to exercise sovereignty. This conviction is not lost, but the prevailing feeling of the American people corresponds with the prevailing feeling of the Taft party—regret that we are there and longing to get out creditably. We have no wish to hold them as a subject dependency. We have no desire to exploit them. On the contrary, we all—or almost all—honestly wish to train and educate them as speedily as possible in a common language and the principles of self-government for either qualified or absolute independence.

The Filipinos desire independence and the Americans wish them to have it. The only difference between us, or among ourselves, is as to time. When the treaty with Spain was ratified, two resolutions were introduced in the Senate to this end. The Bacon resolution had the support of most of the Democrats and a few of the Republicans. The McNary resolution had the support of most of the Republicans and a few Democrats. The two resolutions agreed in this: That the Philippines were not to be held as an integral part of the country. The difference was that the Bacon resolution was for speedy withdrawal and recognition of independence, while the McNary resolution declared for their future disposal according to the best interests of the people of the United States and the people of the Philippine Islands. It was therefore a unanimous declaration of the Senate that the islands were not to be held as an integral part of the United States.

TARIFF SUBSIDY.

The danger of the course which we are at present attempting is that it will surely result in making them an integral part of this country by legislation, instead of holding them as a separate political body, having all the attributes of autonomy except the Central Government, which we have created—the Philippine Commission. It is proposed to extend our coast navigation laws to them, so as to give our shipowners the monopoly of their business, and to withdraw the tariff barriers between the two countries in such a way as to practically destroy their tariff system and to seriously affect our own by complicating the tariff policy of both countries. The fiscal and tariff interests of the two countries will be so interwoven as to prevent us from cutting the Philippines loose from connection with this country when it becomes desirable to do so.

The alleged purpose of this legislation regarding the tariff is to give Philippine products unrestricted access to our markets, where the price of sugar and tobacco, and some other products, is raised high above the international level by our protective tariff. But it means much more to us than simply extending to the Filipino producer the same high rates which protection affords our own producers. It means more to the country, more to every American.

The result of this legislation, so far as sugar is concerned, is to double the price which the Filipino could obtain anywhere outside of America. It will undoubtedly encourage him in the production of sugar, but the price will be paid by the American consumer, who is compelled to stand the burden of nearly \$100,000,000 annually on sugar, under a tariff the purpose of which was to encourage home production and raise a large revenue from the foreign product. It will render abortive the very purpose of the tariff, and will accustom the Filipino to a price for his sugar which is double what he can get from the rest of the world, thus preventing any political action in the future which would sever the two countries. So, also, the extension of our navigation laws will build up a great shipping interest, whose profits will depend upon the monopoly of Philippine transportation. This interest will also seek to block any legislation in the future looking to the disposition of the islands.

If our purpose is, as we have declared, to fit the Filipinos for self-government and to give them their independence, shall we not defeat our purpose by building up powerful interests which, in the very nature of things, must block such legislation? If we pursue this system of subsidy to the Filipino, shall we really benefit him in the end? Will not the withdrawal of it, in case we finally conclude to follow our original purpose and give the Filipinos the independence which they want and we want them to have, plunge them into a condition of suffering and distress such as they have never realized?

SELF-SUSTAINING METHODS.

The real difficulty with the Philippines is that the people do not know how to work to advantage and how to produce in large and profitable quantities. The islands are agricultural, and never will be anything else, but the methods of production are primitive beyond description—a forked stick for a plow, the soil stirred to a depth of 3 inches, a buffalo for the motive power of the sugar mill, and hand labor everywhere instead of machinery. Subsidizing the products with fictitious prices is one way to stimulate them, but artificial aid can not be suspended without unnecessary suffering.

The right way to help the Filipinos is to train them in self-sustaining methods. The declared purpose of this whole movement in the Philippines is philanthropic. Philanthropy always costs the philanthropist something, and whatever form our philanthropy takes, we must be prepared for certain expense; but this proposed scheme of philanthropy, through subsidized inflation of prices to be obtained in America, not only threatens grave danger in the future; it also creates dishonest bookkeeping. It can easily be shown that through this system the islands will cost America, in subsidies alone, in the next 20 years, from \$300,000,000 to \$500,000,000, which our accounts with the Philippines will not show a penny of.

A much wiser way is that the aid should take two forms—one for education, one for improved methods in agriculture.

In the Philippines there are 2,000,000 children of school age. Only 500,000 are now at school. If we wish to train them in a common language as a means to self-government, it should be done at once. Delay will only add to the cost. The school system is established. The \$2,000,000 per annum which the Filipino Government, out of its scanty revenue, applies to this purpose, is insufficient. It will require much more, particularly if the needed agricultural and manual training schools are started. If we are bent upon real philanthropy we should appropriate the additional amount necessary and let the books show the loss.

Improved methods of agriculture should be accomplished not by direct appropriation but by the organization of an agricultural bank, such as has proved so advantageous to the Egyptian peasants. This Government should furnish the capital. Private enterprise can not be relied upon for this kind of banking. The only banks in the Orient are commercial corporations, mainly engaged in exchange, not in loaning money. They make large profits out of the inequalities in the value of money in the various countries, and have nothing to loan upon farming securities. It is the farmer, in the Philippines, who must receive aid. Direct and artificial aid will simply demoralize him or encourage foreigners to crowd him off the soil as long as it lasts. Loans by an agricultural bank, secured by the land he must improve and by the modern machinery required for its best development, would tend to promote both independence and self-respect. A Government bank could be so conducted as to effect the agricultural regeneration of the Philippine Islands, if the islands are worth anything at all—if they are worth regenerating. If they are not worth anything, the sooner we find it out the better—and we shall find it out quicker and at less cost in this way than in any other.

If we should properly develop the field of action of an agricultural bank, taxable property would be created in the Philippines that would relieve us of the expense of education, and enabling the islands to assume the burden without knowing it.

A SEPARATE AUTONOMY.

Thus the desired end would be accomplished, with the maintenance in the Philippines of an absolutely separate autonomy, at a cost which is nothing compared with the three to five hundred millions which we shall actually pay, if the subsidy system is followed for the same length of time, and with the infinitely better result that, instead of being tangled in tariff and navigation complications impossible to sever without causing untold distress, the islands will be self-sustaining, self-supporting, self-governing, only connected to this country by the appointed Philippine Commission, acting as the higher house—the Governor General as chief executive.

By this means we shall have established, in 20 years, a complete, autonomized government in the Philippine Islands; a government absolutely uncomplicated with our own; with its own fiscal system, its own revenue system and all the attributes—judicial, legislative, and executive—that are essential to national life. Then, when the time comes to cut the knot, it will be a safe and easy matter, after reserving a naval and coaling station, to permit the Filipino to cast off and sail away into the ocean of independence.

WASHINGTON, D. C.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. STONE. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After five minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 4 o'clock and 50 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Friday, January 28, 1916, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate January 27, 1916.

SECRETARY OF EMBASSY.

CLASS 5.

Oliver B. Harriman to be secretary of embassy or legation of class 5.

POSTMASTERS.

CALIFORNIA.

Mary G. Mails, San Quentin.

COLORADO.

James A. Rutledge, Woodmen.

CONNECTICUT.

Daniel F. Finn, Jewett City.

John F. Oates, Windsor Locks.

FLORIDA.

P. M. Elder, Sanford.

GEORGIA.

Buford L. Heartsill, Dalton.

H. J. Jolly, Cartersville.

David A. Trundle, Ringgold.

INDIANA.

Henry O. Eldridge, Lagrange.

Vern Hahn, Wakarusa.

IOWA.

George F. Althouse, Ackley.

James Duggan, Melrose.

Harold H. Holmes, New Albin.

Charles F. Irons, Garrison.

Fred L. Ives, Hamburg.

Magnus A. Merkel, Keystone.

Carl Reinecke, jr., Elkader.
Philip D. Switzer, St. Charles.
William B. Trullinger, Farragut.
Thomas J. White, Whittemore.
Clyde L. Woods, Garwin.

KANSAS.

Cecil Calvert, Quinter.

T. J. Foley, Chapman.

Dorothy F. Derrick, Hugoton.

Edward Grauerholz, Esbon.

W. L. Ringo, Girard.

KENTUCKY.

J. Walter Payne, Paris.

LOUISIANA.

Charlton Fort, Minden.

Floyd C. Mitchell, Zwolle.

MAINE.

A. W. Willey, Cherryfield.

MISSISSIPPI.

Coke B. Wier, Quitman.

MISSOURI.

Edverda Barnes, Pilot Grove.

Thomas P. Diggs, New Haven.

MONTANA.

Mary E. Turrell, Drummond.

NEW JERSEY.

F. J. Dushanek, Garwood.

Paul F. Edwards, Newfield.

Charles R. Grover, Atlantic Highlands.

NEW YORK.

James W. Larkin, Brockport.

NORTH CAROLINA.

Frank W. Miller, Waynesville.

OKLAHOMA.

Alva P. Daniel, Commerce.

Alfa Gibbins, Fort Sill.

Ora E. McCague, Ralston.

OREGON.

Walter L. Hembree, McMinnville.

SOUTH CAROLINA.

James A. Barrett, Clover.

TEXAS.

Mrs. Ross Manning, Madisonville.

WEST VIRGINIA.

Ida J. Garrison, Lost Creek.

REJECTION.

Executive nomination rejected by the Senate January 27, 1916.

POSTMASTER.

William M. Huntley to be postmaster at Rush Springs, Okla.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

THURSDAY, January 27, 1916.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal and ever-living God, in whom all our longings, hopes, and aspirations are centered, we thank Thee for the phenomenal growth of our past, for the auspicious present, for the hopes and ever-widening promises of our future as a people. Impress, we beseech Thee, every American citizen with the responsibility resting upon him as such, and illumine the minds of these their servants that they may be guided by Thy counsels, that in the present crisis of the world everything may be put to the crucial test of reason and justice. If it is wisdom to prepare for the worst, let it be adequately and efficiently done; but let us hope and pray for the best, that we may not be called upon to defend our sacred rights by the destructive agencies of war, but rather by the rational and peaceful methods of arbitration. And Thine be the praise forever and ever. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

LIFE AND PUBLIC SERVICES OF WILLIAM MCKINLEY.

Mr. FOSS. Mr. Speaker, next Saturday, the 29th, is generally recognized as "McKinley Day" inasmuch as that was the day on which he was born; and I desire to ask unanimous consent to address the House for 40 minutes on the life, character, and public services of William McKinley, to follow immediately Mr. HENRY, of Texas, who I believe has the consent of the House to speak on that day immediately following the approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Foss] asks unanimous consent to be permitted to address the House for 40 minutes on next Saturday at the close of the remarks of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. HENRY], said remarks to be commemorative of former President McKinley. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

EXPOSITION AT PENSACOLA, FLA.

Mr. WILSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I desire to ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the Legislature of Florida with respect to the holding of an exposition in the city of Pensacola to celebrate the cession of Florida by Spain to the United States, said exposition to be held in the year 1919, and at a later day I will address the House on the subject of asking Congress to assist us.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. WILSON] asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD by printing a resolution of the Legislature of Florida looking toward an exposition to celebrate the cession of Florida to the United States. Is there objection?

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the gentleman from Florida, is it the purpose of this movement to make this exposition national in its scope?

Mr. WILSON of Florida. Well, at this time it is in its incipency, and we hope the Congress will assist us.

Mr. BARNHART. If it were purely a local matter with which only the State has to do, I should be disposed to object, but if it is to be national in its scope, as other expositions have been, I would have no objection.

Mr. WILSON of Florida. We intend, as I stated, to ask Congress to help us to make the matter more than of local interest, because I think it should be.

Mr. BARNHART. I have no objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

THE EUROPEAN WAR AND INDUSTRIAL DEMOCRACY.

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by printing a speech delivered by Hon. Joseph E. Davies, chairman of the Federal Trades Commission, before the American Manufacturers' Export Association, in New York City, on the European war and industrial democracy.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. HOWARD] asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD by printing a speech delivered by Hon. Joseph E. Davies, of New York, on the European war. Is there objection?

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the gentleman from Georgia if the author of this speech holds any official position?

Mr. HOWARD. He is chairman of the Federal Trades Commission, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. MANN. That is the new commission.

Mr. HOWARD. And the speech, I will state to the gentleman from Indiana, is one containing information gathered by this officer, which, I believe, will be of much value not only to Congress but to the country in general.

Mr. BARNHART. Does the Federal Trades Commission make an official report to Congress?

Mr. HOWARD. I think it does, but I do not know.

Mr. MANN. Once a year.

Mr. HOWARD. It is a very recent organization, as the gentleman knows. I do not know what they have done or what they propose to do, but this is a speech worthy of the consideration—

Mr. MANN. I hope the gentleman from Indiana—

Mr. HOWARD (continuing). Of all statesmen like the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. MANN (continuing). Will not object because the Federal Trades Commission, whatever they may do, are trying to do something.

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Speaker, as far as "the gentleman from Indiana" is concerned, he is not disposed to object to anything that will contribute information to the public by a

public official in relation to what his department may be doing; but in these instances, where these commissions and other departments have the facilities and money appropriated to make reports from time to time, I would doubt the propriety of permitting the promiscuous admission of their statements to the RECORD. So far as I am concerned, however, in this instance, I think I will not object.

Mr. ADAMSON. Mr. Speaker, as I tried to present my opportunity to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BARNHART], I desire now, as he yielded on my rising, to thank him for his amiability.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. CHARLES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have my remarks on the child-labor bill inserted in the RECORD.

Mr. MANN. There is general leave to print on the child-labor bill.

The SPEAKER. The Chair did not understand the request.

Mr. CHARLES. I want to ask unanimous consent to have my remarks on the child-labor bill printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Everybody has leave to print for five legislative days.

Mr. CARTER of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have my remarks inserted in the RECORD on the one hundredth anniversary of the birth of Gen. Banks, of Massachusetts.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CARTER] asks leave to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the life and character of the late Gen. Banks, of Massachusetts. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

LATE REPRESENTATIVE ALFRED MILNES.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I desire to ask unanimous consent to address the House briefly on the life and character of Alfred Milnes, a former Member of this House during the Fifty-fourth Congress, who has recently passed away.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan asks unanimous consent to address the House. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, it is with profound sorrow that I rise to speak upon the life and character of a former Member of this House during the Fifty-fourth session, who at that time represented the district which I now have the honor to represent in the State of Michigan.

The Hon. Alfred Milnes was one of the prominent citizens of that great State. His life and character were interwoven with the best traditions and the civic progress of that great Commonwealth. He passed away on the 15th day of January, 1916, after a somewhat protracted illness, at his home in the city of Coldwater, which is a thriving city in my district. In the Biographical Congressional Record it is stated of him:

Milnes, Alfred, a Representative from Michigan; born in Bradford, Yorkshire, England, May 28, 1844; came with his parents to the United States in 1854, and settled in Newton, Iowa; moved to Coldwater, Mich.; attended the common schools of Utah, Iowa, and of Coldwater, Mich.; enlisted as a private in the Seventeenth Michigan Infantry, the "Old Stonewall Regiment," June 30, 1862, and served throughout the war; engaged with his regiment in every battle in which it took part, from South Mountain, Md., in 1862, to Lee's surrender at Appomattox in April, 1865; city alderman of Coldwater one term and mayor two terms; member of the State senate 1888-1890; lieutenant governor of Michigan in 1894, and presided over the State senate until his resignation, June 1, 1895; elected as a Republican to the Fifty-fourth Congress, to fill vacancy caused by the resignation of Julius C. Burrows, and served from December 2, 1895, to March 3, 1897; appointed postmaster of Coldwater in 1898; delegate in the Michigan constitutional convention 1907-1908; member of board of managers Michigan Soldiers' Home; a resident of Coldwater, Mich.

Much might be added to this modest sketch of his life, which probably received his approval for use in the directory, if it was not wholly written by himself. The life of Mr. Milnes was blended with the civic and business activities not only of his home city of Coldwater but of the State of Michigan. It was my pleasure, and I might say good fortune, to make his acquaintance during the convention which nominated him for Congress in 1895. I was a candidate for the same office, but was defeated by one vote on the two hundred and seventy-fourth ballot. Since that time and always thereafter we were the best of friends, and I am sincerely sorrowful because of his departure.

It must be said of Mr. Milnes that he was a firm and resolute man; a man of strong activities and of strong convictions. He was prosperous in his business undertakings and always took a prominent part in public affairs. He held many positions of public trust, in all of which he gave his best efforts and filled them with much credit to himself and with ability and honor to

the position. We knew him as the soldier-statesman. Courageous and strong, he was a good debater and an opponent worthy of one's best efforts. It was my privilege to serve with him in the convention of 1908 which drafted the new constitution for the State of Michigan, which was so strongly approved and ratified by the people and now so favorably considered by them. Many of its best provisions bear the impress of his efforts and are tempered with his strong mentality. I think it can be said of him that he never shrunk from a duty or turned lightly from a task.

He was always proud of having served his country in the great rebellion that preserved its Union. During his services in this House in the Fifty-fourth Congress he voted for the bankruptcy act. He also voted for the immigration bill containing a literacy test. He also voted for the recognition of Cuban belligerency on the 2d of March, 1896. He served as a Republican member upon the Committee on Levees and Improvements of the Mississippi River and on the Committee on the District of Columbia. He was sworn into office on the 4th of March, 1895, and his term expired on the 4th of March, 1897.

He has gone, but his kindly deeds and loving memory will live on and lend comfort to all who knew him for years to come. He died in the Christian faith. He was vestryman of his church when he passed away. He will be missed by his State and his city, and be mourned by a large concourse of friends. His citizenship was of the highest order. His life was worthy of our emulation. And whether birth or death is but the beginning of a brighter future, may all be well with him.

And thus asserting my profound respect for his memory, and in his closing the book upon a useful life I can only say farewell to my friend, a former Member of this House, knowing his deeds will last although his labors have ceased.

Sleep, Holy Spirit,
While the stars burn, the moons increase,
And the great ages onward roll.

WITHDRAWAL OF PAPERS.

Mr. KALANIANAOLE, by unanimous consent, was granted leave to withdraw from the files of the House the papers in the case of Barclay S. Dennison (H. R. 11627, 62d Cong.), no adverse report having been made thereon.

PREPAREDNESS.

The SPEAKER. Under special order, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GALLIVAN] is recognized for 30 minutes. [Applause.]

Mr. GALLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I listened with interest and admiration a few days ago to the remarks of the distinguished Republican leader of this House, who is always interesting and who has always something to say of an illuminating nature, when he was advising both sides of the House as to the position he takes on the question of preparedness. His was a truly American speech [applause], and I was one of those who most warmly congratulated him for it. I think he said, and I agree with him, that this session is one of the most momentous in the history of Congress. We are confronted with problems growing out of the European war and the disturbance on our southwestern borders which call for the highest statesmanship that the men in this Congress can bring to bear upon them, for upon their wise solution will depend in a great measure the future welfare of the country.

Grave issues are confronting us, and there is need of the most disinterested patriotism if they are to be discussed and settled for the Nation's well-being. Let me say at the outset that I am one of those who believe in getting ready. I stand firmly and unchangeably for a program of preparedness. [Applause.] And let me say also that I believe a policy of preparedness, involving a change at variance with all the traditions of the past, is not to be lightly entered upon, but must be viewed calmly in all its bearings before a judicious decision may be reached. No one man's ipse dixit can be a reason for bringing about such a far-reaching change, and we must remember this fact. The measure is fraught with consequences too tremendous for the future, and the collective wisdom of Congress will be put to the test to find the adequate and proper solution. In my judgment in no other manner will we be able to agree on the kind of preparedness that this country now needs.

Mr. Speaker, we must be calm in the discussion of these new questions that have arisen, and we must be just in our view in judging of events and their bearing upon our national life, and our decision must be free from every other consideration than the welfare of this Nation.

How necessary this temper of mind is in the present crisis is apparent to anyone who has been following the trend of recent events. If at any time within the last decade of years before the opening of the European war anyone were to

prophesy that the Congress of these United States would shortly be engaged in discussing the ways and means to meet the aggressions of an European foe and would be considering the advisability of creating an enormous military and naval establishment and of increasing to an unheard-of extent the burden of taxation, such a prophet of evil would be laughed to scorn.

Yet, strange to say, such is the unexpected turn events have taken. How did it happen that we, who were pursuing the ways of peace, free from entanglements of European politics, with no enemies on our borders whom we need fear, and with no cause of offense before the great warring nations, but equally at peace and on friendly terms with them all, should suddenly feel ourselves menaced with danger and forced to think of making a violent leap into the costly business of military and naval expenditure on an enormous scale? How did all this come about? Who is responsible for it? Is anyone guilty? Or must the blame be placed merely upon the logic of events? These are questions of vital and far-reaching importance. Upon the answer to be given to them will depend in a great measure the character of the action we are about to take. Mr. Speaker, the country has a right to know the answer, for its supreme interests are involved. It is the duty of every Representative of the people to find out where blame should be put, if blame there be, that he may act intelligently and patriotically for the best interests of the Nation.

Oh, I wish that the Farewell Address of Washington, the Father of his Country, had been in our hands for constant study since the opening of this dire conflict on the other side of the Atlantic! The one admonition which stands out in that imperishable document and which has had more to do in shaping our traditional policy with the nations of Europe than any other influence is his warning to beware of entangling alliances with them. I take these words in their fullest and broadest sense. I believe that the mind of Washington was that we should be not only neutral in their quarrels but absolutely impartial. He was a wise man and a great patriot. Would that his advice had been followed and that we could appear before the world to-day, as I think he would have us appear, without even the suspicion of favoring one side or the other.

When this tremendous war broke out we were in peaceful and friendly relations with all the belligerents. As far as human prudence can foresee our providential mission was to maintain strict neutrality and the friendship of each and all. It was not our quarrel; we were in no way involved. The future of our country depended in no way whatsoever upon the result of the contest. We had been kept free for almost a hundred years from war with any real European power. Our plain destiny pointed to the supreme office which should be ours. Our country loved peace and was following in its ways, and everything seemed to indicate that ours was to be the high and noble task of peacemaker.

The President's message on neutrality was received with universal acclaim. We rejoiced in the fact that we were citizens of a free and peaceful country. I want to say now, Mr. Speaker, that did we hold the position to-day which we then occupied the war would be at a close and the belligerents would be looking to neutral and impartial America as to the ark of the covenant to bring about peace. We would to-day occupy a position of moral grandeur never yet held by any nation in the world. We would be the peacemaker of the earth. Can any gain in material prosperity compensate us for the loss of such a high vantage ground? Mr. Speaker, I regret exceedingly that such an opportunity was allowed to be lost. It may not return again. I deplore the following of mere legality instead of the higher morality and sensitive impartiality and the substitution of economic advantage for the new freedom. Instead of now standing on the heights with our faces turned toward the morning and the dawn of a better era, I fear we are groping in the lowlands, with the conflicting passions which have ever separated men and nations dinning in our ears.

I can not help thinking—and although I say it with all candor, still I utter it with deep regret—that if the policy of "watchful waiting" had been used toward the European war and the one of "alert action" toward Mexico, we should to-day occupy in the world a proud moral eminence, surrounded by the universal gratitude and admiration of the nations. [Applause.] How could we be so shortsighted as to lose such a glorious opportunity? I do not think for a moment it was mere love of money, although that has been always one of the most potent causes of human action. No, Mr. Speaker, I think I can here and now place my finger on what I consider the worst menace in this country to-day. We are hearing much of "hyphenated citizens" and "America first," but the most violent propaganda working among us at the present time and the most dangerous one, to my mind, is the pro-British, whose protagonists reveal

in their every utterance that the dominant motive power in their lives is not "America first," but "England first." [Applause.]

I do not know whether it is a disease or a deep-seated prejudice, but it is mischievous and unpatriotic. [Applause.] It is based on a false conception of historic facts, yet it steals all the assurance of truth with the superadded effrontery of humbug. Modesty it has none. It fills the public press with its clamor, and really one begins to think after a while these people are obsessed with the idea that the one mission America has in the world is to save England. And a portion of this press, I am sorry to say, allows its columns to be fed by misinformation and news pervisions supplied from British sources, and its editorial expression is inspired from British "news" agencies, written by interests antagonistic to American peace and well-being.

I refer only to those newspapers that aim to poison the American public mind against the patriotic interests of America, and seek by falsehood, slander, and misrepresentation to set one class of Americans against others. These are the papers responsible for the so-called "hyphen" campaign to discredit a class of American citizens whose loyalty and fidelity to the Republic have been proven on a hundred battle fields. [Applause.]

And what shall I say of our great American statesmen? This much at least: I have no sympathy with the Lodge-Roosevelt-Choate-Root interpretation of history. [Applause.] It is spurious and superficial; it does not get down to the origin of things. They would have us believe that all the fundamental rights we possess are a heritage bequeathed to us by England. I can not accept such a low estimate of American liberties. I do not for a moment acknowledge any such debt. I do not ascribe to any lower source the principle of individual liberty upon which this Government is founded than to the founder of Christianity Himself.

I beg to remind these advocates of a pro-British policy that the Magna Charta to which they are constantly appealing was forced from a reluctant despot, King John, by the barons of England with the help of the Christian Church when that church was one throughout all Christendom. It was simply the translation to the political order of the principle of equality which the church had preached from the beginning. But in the Magna Charta it is quite limited in its scope. The first experiment on a large scale of this principle to political government occurred among us when the framers of the Constitution, acting under the impulse of a higher power, we can not doubt, and as a protest to the tyranny of oligarchical England, established democracy here in its plenitude. [Great applause.]

For 40 years, Mr. Speaker, we enjoyed the blessings of a pure democracy before the effect of this universal application of the rule of the people reached England and brought about the reform of 1832, the first advance of centuries on the part of England toward our democratic ideal. These people who seek to give us any different explanation of the facts of history are not genuine Americans; they are Tories. We have always had them in our history. I do not believe for a moment that America, as we know it to-day, is an offspring of British institutions. I believe she has a character and genius of her own. Discovered after centuries of life had been granted to the nations of the European Continent, the lifting of the veil that concealed her, a feat that was accomplished by the intrepid genius of Columbus, had in it the providential promises of a new future. That providence will be secured if we are all truly Americans first—not in any spurious sense, but in the real meaning of the term—conscious of the high vocation to which we have been called as the crusaders of a new era in which the rights of man occupy the foremost place and the peace of the people is put before the pecuniary advantage of a moment.

Upon Congress devolves the high and noble duty to find some way to lead the country to these higher ideals. There is no nobler work to which the representatives of a free people may set their hands. May the collective wisdom of this Congress find for us the way of safety and of honor that leads to national rectitude and moral grandeur which should be to-day, as they ever will be, the hope and ambition of a free people. [Long-continued applause.]

MEXICO.

The SPEAKER. Under the special order, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HUMPHREY] is recognized for 40 minutes. [Applause.]

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact of the killing of many Americans recently in Mexico, the news of the last of which has come to us to-day, the murdering of four American soldiers, confirmation of which I

understand has just reached the State Department, I make no apology for talking upon affairs in Mexico.

I think it is a good thing for us to stand by the President in all matters of foreign affairs where we can, but I think it is a better thing for us to stand by our own country. [Applause.]

I want to take for my text to-day a plank from the Democratic platform adopted at Baltimore, and I will apologize to my Democratic friends for reading it, and will assure them that it is not done in malice:

The constitutional rights of American citizens should protect them on our borders and go with them throughout the world, and every American citizen residing or having property in any foreign country is entitled to and must be given the full protection of the United States Government, both for himself and his property.

That is in the platform upon which Woodrow Wilson was elected, and that is the plank that has been forgotten and superseded by "watchful waiting." What patriotic Democrat can read that plank in his platform to-day breathing, as it does, of patriotism and real red-blood Americanism, and then read the list of assaults, assassinations, and murders in Mexico without a feeling of humiliation and regret? And yet that immortal document of decadent and discredited promises ended with these heroic words:

Our pledges are made to be kept when in office as well as relied upon during the campaign.

No one doubts the patriotism, the honesty of purpose, and the high ideals of the President in regard to his foreign policy; but it is with regret that I say that I believe that the opinion of the great majority of the American people of all parties to-day, is that he is a scholar, a dreamer, a theorist that has been remarkably successful when he has had the power of coercion in dealing with weaker and immature intellects, as strikingly demonstrated in his domineering control of college students and Democratic Congressmen. But in larger affairs he apparently becomes timid and uncertain. Napoleon declared:

By sticking to no plan you risk being beaten everywhere. The worst fault in the conduct of affairs is vacillation.

Vacillation is the trouble with the Mexican situation. Vacillation has superseded "watchful waiting." Obstinacy and timidity is not an unusual combination even in men of great intellectual ability, especially where the library takes the place of experience.

The President's policy in Mexico is not based upon his party platform. It is characterized by weakness, uncertainty, vacillation, and uncontrollable desire to intermeddle in Mexican affairs. He has not had the courage to go into Mexico nor the courage to stay out.

The President has repeatedly declared that he would not interfere in Mexico nor permit others to do so. At Indianapolis he said:

Have not European nations taken as long as they wanted and spilled as much blood as they pleased in the settling of their affairs; and shall we deny that right to Mexico because she is weak? No, I say.

At Columbus, Ohio, in his recent speech he said:

The Mexicans may not know what to do with their government; but that is none of our business, and, so long as I have the power to prevent it, nobody shall "butt in" to alter it for them.

At the notable talk in the White House not long ago to the Democratic National Committee where he referred to other people "talking through their hat," if he is correctly reported, he declared "that the Mexicans can raise all the h— they please; it is none of our business." Remember, the language I am using is not mine but the reported language of the President. Certainly their ability to raise what he so delicately described, ought to satisfy even the President and that wing of the Democratic Party that believes in "watchful waiting."

But if the President had followed these declarations, however un-American and indefensible they may be, it would have been far better for us and probably for Mexico. But his deeds have been strangers to his words. Instead of a policy of "hands off" it has been a policy of constant interference in Mexican affairs.

The President told Huerta that he must not be a candidate; that he would not be recognized. He talked about fair elections and constitutional government, and showed a strong desire not only to control Mexican politics but to go into Mexico and regulate the land system of that country. He sent his secret special agents to Mexico City and became involved in a personal quarrel with Huerta. This controversy reached its climax in the most grotesque and stupendous piece of folly in the history of civilized nations when the President appeared here before Congress and virtually asked that the United States declare war against Huerta, the individual. And, what was even more ridiculous and absurd, it was done. And for what reason? Who to-day will tell us the cause of that action? Americans had been driven from Mexico; American property had been destroyed in Mexico;

American men had been murdered in Mexico; American women had been outraged in Mexico, but all these did not disturb the serenity of "watchful waiting," or recall to the mind of the President the Democratic platform declarations about protecting life and property of American citizens along the border and on foreign soil.

We were told that Huerta was a murderer, an assassin, a usurper and a traitor, and a man that we would never under any circumstances recognize. But Huerta, the individual, not representing Mexico but himself, had refused to salute the American flag on a gasoline launch in a place where it had no right to be; or, to be exact, for the sake of history, Huerta agreed to fire 6 guns in salute, while the President, as I recall, demanded 21. This insult from an assassin and a murderer that we would not in anyway recognize was more than this administration, too proud to fight, could endure. Our magnificent battleship squadron was hurried to Mexican waters, although at that time the Mexican Navy consisted of one old antiquated gunboat. The Army was sent to Mexico, and, after Vera Cruz was bombarded by our Navy, it was landed on Mexican soil. Seventeen of our own soldiers lost their lives and more than 100 Mexicans were killed. We seized the customhouse and carried away more than a million dollars. And all this for what purpose? Why did we go to Mexico and what did we accomplish and why did we return? We were told that a German vessel was about to land a cargo of guns and ammunition, and this was the reason for hurrying our Navy to Mexican waters. But that same German vessel landed its cargo in Mexico. We are told that our Army and Navy went to Mexico to make Huerta apologize. Has anyone read that apology? We are told that our Army and Navy went to Mexico to make Huerta salute the flag. Has anyone heard that salute? And after this magnificent performance we returned again. What did we accomplish and under what pretense did we take the \$1,000,000 belonging to Mexico, and what has become of it and where is it now? The immortal general that marched his men up the hill and then marched them down again was a great military genius and won a magnificent victory as compared with our vaudeville and discreditable performance in Mexico.

Many times after we withdrew from Mexico the flag was desecrated and insulted without protest and almost without notice. After the Huerta incident James McManus, an American citizen of high standing, was killed by Mexican soldiers in his own dooryard. The American flag flying over his house was torn down and trampled in the filth of the street. Some weeks afterwards the Secretary of State made a report on this cowardly assassination to the effect that they—meaning the particular bandit that he was at that time assisting—had agreed to pay an indemnity for the killing of McManus, but that he had forgotten whether or not they had agreed to apologize for insulting the flag.

At one time this administration was so sensitive of the sacred honor of our flag that the Army and Navy were used to force a salute, when murder and assassination of our citizens could not provoke action. Again, the trampling of our flag in the dust was such an insignificant trifle that it left no impression on the ponderous intellect of the great preacher of Chautauqua peace at most any cash price.

There are none to-day but what know that the flag-saluting episode was but a mere pretext eagerly sought to invade Mexico and drive out Huerta.

Poor old Huerta! He has "gone home and ta'en his wages." According to our standards he was an old villain, but he at least had courage and ability. His name is written forever among the immortals as the only individual in all the world's history with whom a mighty nation went to war.

And yet we have been told countless times that the administration is entitled to great credit for keeping us out of war with Mexico. If we had landed an army in Japan or Germany or England or any other first-class power; if we had bombarded one of their cities, killed their citizens, landed our army on their soil, seized and carried off their customs revenue, would we have had war? If that is not war, what does it take to make war? Are we entitled to any credit for escaping war only because we bullied and fought a nation too weak and helpless to defend itself?

Our policy in Mexico has earned us the contempt of the world and beyond question has greatly influenced the warring nations of Europe in their present attitude toward us.

Our Mexican fiasco, discrediting and humiliating as it was, taught us nothing. "Watchful waiting" continued to be only a phrase, for we still intermeddled and interfered. The administration still insisted on helping one bandit and highwayman against another. Villa now became the administration's pet. Laudatory letters giving an account of the career of this

bloody cutthroat were sent out with the approval, if not at the suggestion, of the State Department. He was permitted to purchase arms and ammunition in the United States, and this was done against the earnest protest and warning from many American citizens and especially those along our international boundary. Some of this very ammunition may have been used in the recent dastardly and cruel murder of Americans.

Negotiations were carried on with Villa and promises made to him, and it seemed as if the administration were going to recognize him as the head of the Mexican Government. But suddenly and without explanation the administration turned to Carranza and began to help him as against Villa. It permitted Carranza to send soldiers and guns and ammunition through American territory to be used against Villa. This act is believed by those who are best fitted to judge to be largely if not entirely responsible for the recent tragedy where 18 Americans were killed—one of the most cruel and unprovoked murders that ever took place in that land of blood and assassination, the details of which are too horrible to relate. It was feared that such would be the result of permitting Mexican troops to pass through our country. Many who had friends in Mexico believed that such action on our part would lead to the slaughter of Americans. Nor can the administration plead that it was not warned of the probable result upon American life if this were permitted. The distinguished gentleman from New Mexico, Senator FALL, wrote the State Department a letter, pointing out the great danger of such action and pleading that no such permission should be given to any of the factions. According to press reports published at the time, the acting governor of Sonora, Carlos Randall, sent to the State Department on October 29 last a protest that reads as follows:

Urge him (President Wilson) to revoke immediately permission granted Carranza to send troops over American territory into Agua Prieta, because otherwise we will have to lament any fatal consequences on account of the great danger in which all Americans in Sonora will be placed, for it is impossible for me to repress the fury of the people and the army against the American Government for apparent partiality shown in helping one contending Mexican faction, contrary to all rights. I trust the American Government realizes the gravity of the situation and will revoke the many-times repeated permission.

Many other warnings besides these were received, and the administration can not claim that it permitted this action with no idea of what the result might be.

What right had the administration to rely upon the promises of Carranza? They knew that he was the most unreliable, most uncertain, and most untruthful of the entire bunch of bandits with whom they had been dealing.

On the same day that the press carried the warning from the governor of Sonora it published a statement from Cardinal Gibbons, in which he said:

Poor Mexico! Things are in bad shape there. I have read much in the papers about the final solution of the Mexican situation. I have heard all kinds of promises. But how are we to believe that the problem is solved? Can we place any faith in these promises?

A man of promises; that is Carranza. He can promise many things. But where are the assurances that these promises will be fulfilled? I am hoping and trusting that the troubles in Mexico are at an end, but I am not sure that Carranza is the man who will bring about these desired conditions.

Cardinal Gibbons spoke the feeling that possessed all those who were familiar with conditions in Mexico. Why did not the administration give heed to such warnings as these and take steps to see that Carranza's promises were carried out?

How could the administration expect any other effect from its action favoring Carranza? For months they had favored Villa. They had given him every promise and encouragement. They had advertised him to the world as a great and good man—a patriot fighting for freedom. It is believed that they had given him a promise of recognition, and that if the report of Gen. Scott should be made public it will prove there was such an arrangement.

Then came the sudden change. Villa was pushed aside and Carranza taken up. It was one of those sudden changes from the White House without explanation, such as we have had upon preparedness, upon the Panama Canal, and upon many other propositions which have so recently characterized Executive action.

When Villa with an army of 13,000 men, that he had led across plains and mountains and waterless, treeless deserts, suffering privations and hardships beyond description, arrived at Agua Prieta, where he expected to find a garrison of 1,500 men, he found instead that it was occupied by a force of more than 5,000, that had been sent there through the United States while he was on his way to capture the place. When he attacked he was repulsed by artillery that had been sent there through this country. Here was the former favorite of the administration that believed that he had been deliberately betrayed by his former friends. What would anyone expect would be the result upon the mind of such a bloody-minded

scoundrel as Villa? Is it any wonder that he vowed vengeance against all Americans, and what reason had the administration to think from his career that this vow would not be carried out to the fullest extent in the most cruel and brutal manner?

If we had not the courage to go into Mexico and pacify it, then certainly we ought at least to keep out of this quarrel and not endanger American lives by constantly favoring one faction or the other.

We make a tremendous bluster about the killing of American citizens upon the high seas and fill the air with the tumult and the noise of many typewriters, although the killing is only accidental and undoubtedly really regretted by those who did the act. But so far we have looked with equanimity undisturbed while hundreds of Americans have been purposely foully murdered in Mexico in a most cruel and fiendish manner.

If the people of this country could but read the fearful tale told by the records now hidden in the State Department, if they but knew the truth, they would make the atmosphere so hot that no longer could anyone advocate "watchful waiting" and breathe it and live.

The whole policy of the President in Mexico has been wrong from the very beginning. It has been one of meddling between factions. It has been one of secret and private special agents representing the President personally. It has been a modified plan, followed by Peter the Great, the Caesars, and the Emperor of China. It has no place in this country. Special agents of this character seldom report the truth. They report what they are expected to report. The plan of cutting off the head of the bearer of bad news is not yet entirely obsolete in political life. The foreign affairs of this Government should be carried on through diplomatic channels, in accordance with the recognized system of modern civilization. Diplomatic chaos supreme and irretrievable would reign in this country under this administration if Col. House were to die.

Pitiless publicity has given way to private, special secret negotiations through personal agents and representatives.

The President says that the Mexicans should have "the right to spill all the blood they please," and it is none of our business. Certainly the American people have regretted this expression of the President. I do not believe that the American people believe in this policy of slaughter and savagery. Certainly this has not always been the policy of this Nation. When the shrieks and groans of murdered and tortured men, the sobs and cries of starving women and children in Cuba reached us the American people demanded that these atrocities should end, and when that demand was disregarded our answer was not "watchful waiting," nor did we tell them that they could shed all the blood that they pleased, nor did we say that it was none of our business, but the American people arose as one man, drove the yellow flag of Spain from the Western Hemisphere, and placed Cuba among the nations of the earth. And the day is not far off when the people of this country, regardless of the attitude of the administration, will see that peace is brought to unhappy Mexico.

The President may believe that the Mexicans have the right to shed all the blood that they please. But I most emphatically deny that the Mexicans have the right to shed American blood upon either American or Mexican soil. Paraphrasing a sentence of the eloquent Ingersoll, "A flag that will not protect its citizens everywhere is a filthy rag that contaminates the air in which it floats."

What are the conditions in Mexico to-day after all this time of "watchful waiting"? Starvation, famine, want, robbery, plunder, rapine, assassination, and murder. Every crime and every cruelty that ignorance and hate can invent has been perpetrated, and still there is no end. The only thing that profits by the conditions in that unhappy land is the eager vulture that circles above the scene of slaughter waiting to feed and fatten upon the dead and dying. Dante's hell could add nothing to the horrors of that unfortunate country.

Whenever the question of Mexico is discussed some Democrat in his solemn majesty arises and, with a look of superior wisdom, inquires, What would you do? That question is a confession on the part of the administration of their inability to deal with the situation. Almost any Republican can advise the administration to the advantage of the country upon this question if it will follow the advice.

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Yes.

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. What was the policy of President Taft in Mexico when similar circumstances were transpiring there?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. In the first place there were no "similar circumstances" under President Taft; but if President Taft made a mistake, it is no excuse for the present administration.

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. Is it not a fact that ex-President Taft has practically indorsed the policy of Woodrow Wilson in Mexico?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. President Taft has done some very unwise things, but I do not think he ever went that far. You can not expect a great man to always be right.

Mr. SCHALL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Yes.

Mr. SCHALL. Does the gentleman know whether Turtle Island is fortified by the Japanese?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. No; I have no information whatever on the subject.

Speaking for myself, but believing that I voice the sentiment of the American people, there are some things that I would do in regard to Mexico if upon me rested the responsibility. I would either go into Mexico and pacify the country or I would keep my hands entirely out of Mexico. If we are too proud to fight we should be too proud to quarrel. I would not choose between murderers. I would not permit either side to procure guns or ammunition in this country that may hereafter be used to murder Americans. I would not depend upon secret personal agents for my information. I would deal openly and in the light of day with the Mexican situation. I would practice pitiless publicity as well as preach it. I would give the American people the facts. I would let them know the truth, and if that is done the American people will quickly decide what shall be done. And, above all, I would do this, the thing that should have been done more than three years ago, and if it had been done, the letting of American blood in Mexico would not have occurred; I would serve notice upon all factions that no longer would any of them be permitted, under any pretense whatever, to destroy American property or to murder American men or to ravish American women, and back of that notice I would place the power of this great Republic. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman yields back 10 minutes.

PREPAREDNESS.

Mr. DIES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent to address the House for 15 minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DIES. Mr. Speaker, I know there are a great number of Members of the House of Representatives who are anxious to become leaders. Every good man wants power, to wield it for a good purpose, even though bad men want it for bad purposes. Knowing the love of power to be almost universal and that my colleagues entertain the desire for leadership, I have requested these 15 minutes to give them consolation and some pointers.

This morning's Philadelphia Inquirer has a leading editorial entitled "Congressman MANN as a real leader." I can not read it all—it would take too much time—but I will read the first paragraph. It says:

The vigorous and clearly defined speech of Congressman MANN in favor of strengthening the Army and Navy, and his eloquent plea to make this a national and not a partisan or political question, lifts him into immediate prominence as the real leader of this most important movement.

[Applause on the Republican side.]

Thereby all previous floppers are relegated to the rear. [Laughter.] And this is made the true slogan of leadership—that he who makes the latest flop shall lead us all. [Laughter.]

Now, this latest feat occurred in the garden of my distinguished friend the gentleman from Illinois. He was sitting in his garden—not working in his garden—meditating, and a vision of blighting war came o'er his dreams. He saw this country in deadly strife with the greatest naval power in the world—England—and he decided certain things that he thought ought to be divulged to the House and the country. I wish I was in the secret of the dreams that came to haunt his vision and disturb his peace when he saw his country locked in a struggle with this great naval power, seeing that he had just gone to his garden from a session of Congress where he had led the fight against a larger Navy.

In that session, occurring a few months before this garden meditation, my friend thought the American Navy was greater than that of England—

SEVERAL MEMBERS. Germany.

Mr. DIES. Germany; and he argued that point on page 2673 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Then he thought that \$1,000,000 in the naval bill was too much for air craft, and he proposed to cut it down to \$500,000, as you will see at page 2881. He then thought that \$1,300,000 was quite too much

for air craft in the Army bill, and proposed to cut it down to \$600,000.

Before this garden meditation, in the Congress which preceded it, he made the point of order against \$400,000 for marine barracks, as you will see at page 2888. He also made a point of order against \$500,000 to complete the radio stations, as you will see at page 2922 of the Record. He also made a point of order against two first-class battle cruisers—

Mr. DAVIS of Texas. Amen! [Laughter.]

Mr. DIES. That is what we all said when he was leading that fight.

Mr. DAVIS of Texas. I say it now.

Mr. DIES. While no record of the vote appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, it is not to be doubted that the gentleman from Illinois voted against the amendment to bring into the bill 16 submarines, instead of only 2 as proposed in the bill. Finally he voted against two battleships and in favor of one. He would have done more against the bill, but for the fact that there is a courtesy among leaders, when they are leading an assault upon a bill, that they shall not all assault it at the same time. Other leaders were assaulting different parts of the bill, while the gentleman from Illinois was assaulting these particular parts.

These other leaders, I may say, have meditated in their garden during the vacation between the last session of Congress and this. They will be heard from later as to their attitude, and disclose their garden meditations to the American public.

Page 2108 of the RECORD. Mr. MANN adduces some irresistible logic against the colossal expenditure for the American Navy. I suppose his logic in the meditation in the garden went to smash along with the views he expressed a few months previous. He said on page 2108:

In making reasonable provision for war, that is all we ought to be expected to do; it would be foolish, it seems to me, for any country to spend all of its resources in preparing for war and neglect other things which are much more important.

That brings me to the question which I would like to ask of this new leader with reference to his statement that we should prepare for a greater Navy than Great Britain—I wish he would state to the House the cost of building a navy equal to that of Great Britain. I wish he would suggest to the House the cost of maintaining an American Navy equal to that of Great Britain. I wish he would state in specific terms to the House how much the building program of the American Navy would be if we are to keep pace with Great Britain.

It is easy to glibly say at one session that we will construct but one battleship and be against submarines and aviation, and then, after meditation in the garden, the next session propose that we shall embark upon a program which no political party would stand for, a program which the gentleman himself when reduced to figures would not stand for.

Mr. Speaker, a little later on in the session I shall crave the indulgence of the House, when I can have the time, to discuss the whole preparedness question. I also have meditated somewhat in my garden during the summer, and my meditations were just about what my votes and speeches were when I followed the leadership of the gentleman from Illinois against these large expenditures.

A year ago Germany, England, and all Europe were at war, and a year ago the same state of international politics existed as now, and it naturally produces a lurking suspicion, in my mind at least, that these gentlemen were not so much meditating in their gardens as they were reading the great metropolitan newspapers of the country, which have not published the truth in regard to the American Navy.

The American Navy, which the gentleman from Illinois said was greater than the German a year ago, in spite of his assault on the program, received the largest appropriation in its entire history. In the two years of Mr. Wilson's administration more money was appropriated for the construction of the Navy than in the entire four years of President Taft or in any four years of the Terrible Teddy. Admiral Fletcher says that it is 15 per cent stronger to-day than it was a year ago. To-day the marksmanship of the American Navy is 30 per cent better than it was a year ago. These European Governments, which a year ago, according to the leader from Illinois, were bleeding to death along the lines of Russia and France, have shed oceans of blood and issued billions of bonds. There is less excuse for hysteria to-day than there was a year ago. [Applause.]

There is more need for statesmanship than a year ago, with moving pictures running in this city illustrating the devastation of our country, the ravaging of our homes, all calculated to drive the American people war mad. I wish the gallant leader from Illinois had continued to do battle for the best traditions of our country instead of following off after this

maundling moving-picture campaign, which shows the destruction of our Navy and the invasion of our country without the loss of a single foreign life upon our shores. [Applause.]

INTERNATIONAL HIGH COMMISSION.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take up the bill H. R. 8235, to provide for the maintenance of the United States section of the International High Commission.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Virginia asks unanimous consent to take up for present consideration the bill 8235, of which the Clerk will read the title.

The Clerk read as follows:

Bill H. R. 8235, to provide for the maintenance of the United States section of the International High Commission.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. I ask that the bill be reported.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby given authority, with the approval of the President, to request the United States section of the International High Commission to cooperate with the other sections of the commission on determining the most satisfactory means of carrying out the recommendations of the First Pan American Financial Conference.

For the purpose of meeting such actual and necessary expenses on the part of the United States section of the commission as may arise from its work and investigations, or as may be incidental to its attendance at the meeting of the said International High Commission, the sum of \$40,000 is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of the Treasury, to be immediately available, and to remain available until expended.

The Clerk also read the following committee amendment:

Page 1, strike out lines 3 to 9, both inclusive, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"That the appointment of the nine delegates by the Secretary of the Treasury to represent the United States in the proceedings of the International High Commission to be held in Buenos Aires, Argentina, during the year 1916, in accordance with the action of the First Pan American Financial Conference held in Washington during the year 1915, pursuant to the provisions of an act of Congress, approved March 4, 1915, entitled 'An act making appropriations for the Diplomatic and Consular Service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916,' be, and the same is hereby, approved and confirmed; such delegates shall be known as the United States section of the International High Commission and shall cooperate with the other sections of the commission in taking action upon the recommendations of the First Pan American Financial Conference; and the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to fill any vacancies that may occur in the United States section of said international commission."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I should like to ask the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Flood], chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, if it is intended by the passage of this bill to approve any agreement entered into between the different representatives of these countries at the last meeting of that commission?

Mr. FLOOD. No; it is not. The international high commission will consider the suggestions made by the financial conference and put them into such shape as they think proper and make recommendations to the legislative bodies of the different countries with reference to them. These recommendations will have no effect unless they are approved by the legislative bodies of the various countries.

Mr. WINGO. Is it intended that this commission at its next meeting shall take up any propositions tending to an alliance between this country and the South American countries with reference to Pan American affairs?

Mr. FLOOD. It is intended to take up business propositions with reference to bills of exchange and matters of business intercourse and make recommendations to the legislative bodies of the different countries with a view to bringing about a uniformity in business transactions.

Mr. WINGO. It is intended to limit their work entirely to financial and commercial exchanges?

Mr. FLOOD. Yes.

Mr. WINGO. No political agreements of any kind?

Mr. FLOOD. None whatever.

Mr. WINGO. That would enter into the foreign or domestic policy of the United States or any of those countries?

Mr. FLOOD. None whatever. It would not deal with any such question.

Mr. WINGO. Is it intended that the positions of these delegates appointed on the part of the United States shall be permanent?

Mr. FLOOD. No; they are appointed for this one conference.

Mr. WINGO. This particular meeting?

Mr. FLOOD. Yes; and this appropriation is made for this particular meeting and to bear the expenses that will be incurred between now and the time of meeting and the making of the report to Congress and the publishing of the proceedings of the meeting.

Mr. WINGO. As I understand the gentleman, they are to report whatever their recommendations are to this Congress for action. Of course, any agreement that had to do with foreign affairs would have to take the form of a treaty between the countries affected and would have to be reported to the Senate. Is the gentleman advised whether it is intended to consult the Congress upon any arrangement they may make with reference to financial or commercial agreements?

Mr. FLOOD. Any suggestions that this international commission, composed of not more than nine delegates from each of the 20 or 21 American Republics, shall make will be reported to Congress, and Congress can accept or reject them.

Mr. WINGO. There is no intention to bind the United States through its executive departments to any kind of financial, commercial, or diplomatic arrangements?

Mr. FLOOD. No; it would have no binding effect at all until it is passed by Congress.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. This bill is on the Union Calendar.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Virginia asks unanimous consent to consider the bill in the House as in the Committee on the Whole. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 8235.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 8235, with Mr. DIES in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. If no one desires to be heard on general debate, the Clerk will read the bill for amendment under the five-minute rule.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, if no one else desires to be heard, I do. I think the gentleman from Virginia ought to explain something about the bill and also something about what this conference did at its meetings last summer while it was here. I believe that it was said that a report was sent to each Member of Congress, and doubtless that is true, but it was sent during the summer, probably, when no one was here. At least I never received any copy of the report of what the conference did.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, in the winter of last year Secretary of the Treasury McAdoo conceived the idea of bringing together in a conference the financiers and business men of all the American Republics, with a view to strengthen the ties of friendship existing between these countries and to bring about closer and more important trade relations between them.

His idea was heartily indorsed by the President, the Secretary of State, and the Congress, and provision was made in the 1916 diplomatic and consular appropriation bill for this conference to be held in Washington. An appropriation of \$50,000 was carried in that bill to defray the expenses of it.

This conference was held in this city last May and was attended by a large number of the important financial and commercial men of this country and 18 of the Central and South American countries.

The conference was in session for almost a week, and one of the results of its deliberation was the passage of a resolution unanimously recommending the appointment by each of the countries represented in the conference of a section of an international high commission, which was charged with the duty of perfecting the suggestions made by the conference, and after these suggestions had been perfected of submitting them to their several Governments for adoption or rejection.

This commission was empowered to take up particularly the questions of a currency and exchange standard, the law of negotiable instruments, fiscal and custom regulations, rules for commercial travelers, patent and copyright legislation, and an extension of the process of arbitration for the adjustment of commercial disputes and other matters.

The proposition for such an international high commission was readily adopted by all of the countries concerned, and all of them have appointed sections of this commission.

The suggestion was that each country should appoint not more than nine members of the commission, which should be known as the section of the commission for that particular country. The 19 countries, including the United States, have made their appointments.

It was provided that in each country the secretary of the treasury, or the finance minister, should be the chairman of the section of the commission from his country. Soon after

the conference adjourned, Secretary McAdoo named the United States section of the International High Commission, and it has done much work toward preparing the suggestions which will be made at the meeting of the high commission. The Argentine Government has extended a cordial invitation for the International High Commission to meet in Buenos Aires on April 3, 1916. This invitation has been accepted by all of the countries involved.

The purpose of this bill is to make an appropriation to bear the expenses arising from the appointment of the United States section of the International High Commission, to confirm the appointments of the United States section made by Secretary McAdoo, and to give our section an official status not less definite than that enjoyed by the sections of the commission of other countries.

This appropriation is asked for by the Secretary of the Treasury to carry out these purposes. It is indorsed by the Secretary of State and the President.

I hold in my hand a letter from the President, which I send to the Clerk's desk and ask to have read.

JANUARY 12, 1916.

HON. HENRY D. FLOOD,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. FLOOD: I hope that you will not consider it an unwarranted liberty on my part if I write to urge very strongly the appropriation of \$40,000 for carrying on the work of the United States section of the International High Commission appointed as a result of the action of the Pan American Financial Conference. All of the Central and South American Republics have appointed their sections of this commission; the work of the commission was initiated by the action of the United States; our relations with the Central and South American countries are now upon a happier footing than ever before; and it seems to me of vital consequence for the support of one of the most important parts of our foreign policy that we should sustain our own portion of this work now so successfully inaugurated and progressing so admirably.

Cordially and sincerely, yours,

WOODROW WILSON.

The conception of this conference by Secretary McAdoo was a wise piece of statesmanship; the dignity with which he presided over the conference, and the ability with which he has handled all matters raised by the conference, or suggested by it, has won the admiration of those of all countries who attended the conference or have kept in touch with it.

I will say, Mr. Chairman, that I attended this conference, and the ability with which the Secretary of the Treasury of the United States presided over the conference and the ability and energy with which he has since carried out the suggestions arising from that conference has met the approval of the representatives of all the countries which had representatives in that conference; and I believe he is entitled to the highest commendation on the part of our people.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. FLOOD. Yes, sir.

Mr. MANN. Of course I did not attend that conference, was not here, and have not read the proceedings of the conference. I did read something in the newspapers concerning it, but I am perfectly well aware that that is not always the way to get at what a body really does; but I got the impression somehow, I suppose from something I saw in the newspapers, that the main purpose of this conference when it met was to boost the McAdoo shipping bill. Now, the gentleman was there, and he will know whether that was the case or not.

Mr. FLOOD. I was there, Mr. Chairman, and I know that was not the case.

In the first place, all of the delegates of the foreign countries were, by the action of the United States Congress, the guests of the Nation. It was not possible, and certainly it was not desirable, that they should be forbidden to express their views upon any question which they thought was vital to the commercial and financial interests of Central and South America and the United States. The expressed purposes of the conference were to promote more intimate financial relations between the countries represented in the conference, and, of necessity, everything material to the discussion was properly brought forward. Before the conference assembled in Washington the delegates from Argentina and Chile expressed themselves in newspaper interviews in New York to the effect that the most important thing to be done for the strengthening and development of our financial and commercial relations with South and Central America was the prompt provision of adequate steamship service. They regarded this as of paramount importance. As practical business men they realized that no other element in the structure of international trade was of such absolute and objective necessity.

On the first day of the conference, May 24, 1915, the chairman of the Argentine delegation, Dr. Samuel Hale Pearson, addressed the conference as follows:

Mr. President, before finishing the session of to-day I would like to say that this morning we heard with great pleasure and satisfaction the words of His Excellency the President of the United States with regard

to the ability to strengthen the relations between our countries of North, Central, and South America if we had fast and good steamship communications. I am sure that every one of us here present—I mean of all the Americans—would be very pleased if the honorable Secretary of the Treasury would name a special commission of a few of the principal citizens and most interested men who could give the best ideas as to how to form this combination of North, Central, and South America, united in a special commission that we might call the "commission on fast navigation," to work out a plan whereby with individual capital or with the help of our Governments we could in a short time see a powerful steamship line that would help us to develop our common intercourse and at the same time know that we would be free from having to depend on European powers for the transportation of our merchandise and also to bring us here and to take you south, as we want all the Americas to know each other as we have been accustomed to knowing Europe.

On the following day, May 25, the Secretary of the Treasury appointed a committee representing the South American Republics most interested, namely, Argentina, Brazil, Uruguay, Chile, Peru, and Ecuador, and appointed to represent the United States on the same committee Hon. Edward N. Hurley, of the Federal Trade Commission; Mr. R. Goodwin Rhett, of the United States Chamber of Commerce; Mr. Paul Fuller, of New York; Col. Franklin Q. Brown, of New York; Mr. George W. Norris, of Philadelphia; Mr. Harry A. Wheeler, of Chicago; and Mr. J. G. White, of New York. Manifestly he could not do less, as presiding officer of the conference, than to accede to the wishes of our foreign guests and permit this important subject to be discussed and considered by a committee of the conference and later by the conference itself.

At the seventh session of the conference, May 29, 1915, the committee on transportation submitted its report.

As a result of the discussion and by unanimous vote of the conference, including not only the foreign delegates but those representing the United States, the following resolution was adopted:

Resolved, That it is the sense of this conference that improved ocean transportation facilities between the countries composing the Pan American Union has become a vital and imperative necessity, and that every effort should be made to secure, at the earliest possible moment, such improved means of ocean transportation, since it is of primary importance to the extension of trade and commerce and improved financial relations between the American Republics.

When this resolution was introduced an attempt was made to inject the discussion of the shipping laws of the United States through the offer of an amendment, which the Secretary of the Treasury, as presiding officer, declined to entertain because it had relation to national policies, with which he thought the conference could not properly deal.

On pages 283 and 284 he used the following language:

Now, as I said before, this is not a convention for the purpose of determining national policies. It is a conference for the purpose of exchanging views, laying upon the table all facts and information obtained, together with expressions of opinion from the various countries represented here as to what things are needed, with suggested possible remedies. These are to be sifted by you, and we are going to try to extract from this crucible into which we put all of these suggestions some refined thing which we hope will work to the advantage of our respective countries.

I would therefore suggest that we confine our expression to the resolution which Gov. Francis has offered. I do not think that we are here to discuss government ownership or subsidies or any other such matter. That has become rather a political controversy in this country, and this is not the place to thrash it out.

Dr. Pearson, of Argentina, seconded the resolution above quoted, which was put to the conference and adopted unanimously.

On page 290 Mr. Roger W. Babson, of Boston, asked the chairman if he would consider a motion to have the Secretary of the Treasury appoint a committee from this country on a shipping bill, and so forth. His reply was as follows:

I think it would be unwise to do that. It seems just a bit outside of the scope of this conference. The shipping question here has become very much of a political question, and I am most anxious that politics shall not be injected into this meeting in any form at all.

The gentleman will see from this that the conference was not used at all to boost the shipping bill.

Mr. MANN. I gave, with some reluctance, my personal assent to the provision that became the law and made the appropriation last spring, and yet when I read the newspapers it must have been that I got the impression from them that the conference was being used, it seemed to me, wholly politically, though I did not credit it, as I often do not credit everything I see in print. It seemed impossible that a man like Secretary McAdoo would make use of such an occasion for political purposes. So I am glad to have in the Record the statement which has been made.

Mr. FLOOD. Yes; and I am glad to make it. I was myself very much impressed with the dignity and ability and force with which the Secretary of the Treasury presided over that conference and the intimate knowledge he showed of every question that was raised before it. I was there when this particular matter came up, and I do know that he did everything he could with propriety to prevent any kind of discussion of

the question referred to by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN], and I am very glad to have been able to make this statement here. Of course we know, Mr. Chairman, that our political opponents will criticize things we do, whether there is justification for the criticism or not. And some of the newspapers did refer to this matter in criticism of the Secretary.

I am going to take occasion to refer briefly to the very severe attack which has been made upon the Mexican policy of the administration by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HUMPHREY] in his speech to-day. I hope some time in the near future to get an opportunity to reply in detail to that attack, and I am satisfied I can show to this House and demonstrate to the country that the course pursued by President Wilson in reference to Mexico is the only course that any administration could have pursued with due regard to the honor and interests of the American people. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The one happy circumstance arising out of the present distressing condition of the world is that it has brought the Americas closer together. This situation and the tendency of the cooperation which has resulted therefrom has been strengthened by every act of the present administration. [Applause.]

The President, the Secretary of State, and the Secretary of the Treasury have accomplished great results in replacing the feeling of suspicion and distrust with which we were regarded by our Pan American neighbors with a feeling of trust and generous cooperation and affection. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Our political opponents will, of course, criticize the administration and the majority party, but when the time comes we will appeal from that criticism to the American people upon the record of the Democratic administration and the Democratic Congresses, confident that the people will sustain that record and give the country the blessing of another Democratic administration. [Applause.]

The Wilson administration has drawn the Americas closer together, it has brought prosperity to the entire country, and it has kept us out of war. [Applause.]

To-day we are the only great Nation in the world throughout whose borders peace and prosperity walk hand in hand. These splendid facts will not be forgotten by the people and will give Woodrow Wilson a second term in the White House. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania and Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin rose.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has already recognized the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE].

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, it seems entirely proper, in view of the depleted condition in which the Treasury of the United States finds itself, that we should discuss this problem of financing South America. It is another one of those interesting problems of the present administration that diverts attention from the difficulty that confronts it in the way of raising resources to run the country. But that is not altogether what I want to say.

The distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES], who has risen from the floor to the Chair, and who now presides with great grace over this body, is axiomatic. A little while ago he paraphrased the familiar quotation "He who laughs last laughs best" by suggesting that "He who makes the latest flop shall lead us all." And he had the temerity and the courage, in this present day and generation of kaleidoscopic changes on the part of a Democratic administration, to apply that suggestion to the Republican leader because, in his wisdom, after holding to certain principles of economy in times of peace he suggested that this country should prepare itself against the possibility of an attack.

Now, in all fairness, gentlemen, if he "who flops last is to lead us," then how are we to regard the present occupant of the White House? Is it not apparent, when it comes to the question of flopping, that as a flopper upon great public questions, as a flopper in the face of a platform that he was pledged to live up to, there has never been the superior of the present leader of the Democratic Party? [Applause on the Republican side.]

CHANGES OF FRONT.

Upon this question of a tariff board—and, for the sake of relieving the suspense of the country we may call it a tariff commission—let us consider the announcement which came from the White House only yesterday. After destroying a Republican tariff board, that was as effective as any commission can be under the Constitution; after supposedly covering the powers of such a board in the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce; after "sneaking" a provision into the so-called trade commission bill that was to give ample powers to the administra-

tion for all the purposes of a tariff board or tariff commission, or whatever it might be, we find the gentlemen who marched up the hill upon the Baltimore platform coming down yesterday morning, with the announcement from the White House that after a conference with the distinguished leader of the Democratic Party in this House the program for the future is to include "a tariff commission bill that is to be reported by the Committee on Ways and Means." Speaking of flopping, which is akin to a change of front, the doing to-day that which you promised yesterday not to do—let us see where the leader of Democracy stands in this matter.

WHAT THE PRESIDENT SAID.

In his letter of acceptance to that assembled multitude of Democrats who wandered over to the shores of Jersey two and one-half years ago, the Democratic nominee for the Presidency said.

It is obvious that the changes we make—

And this was with respect to the tariff—

should be made only at such a rate and in such a way as will least interfere with the normal and healthful course of commerce and manufacture. But we shall not on that account act with timidity, as if we did not know our own minds, for we are certain of our ground and of our object.

Mark you, then, when the Democrats had destroyed the Republican tariff board, when you believed that you were in a position to establish a system that would be an improvement upon it, you did not proceed as your candidate for President then said, as if you "did not know your own minds," because you were "certain of your ground." Yes; as certain of your ground as you were when in that speech delivered at Washington Park, N. J., some time after, your same candidate for President declared that that platform which you had adopted at Baltimore was "not molasses with which to catch flies," but was to be lived up to even though in the course of time those who rebelled against it might "be hanged as high as Haman."

Your President "knew his ground" when he was a candidate. You followed him faithfully, believing you knew your ground when you destroyed the institution of protection and that tariff board which the Republican Party had provided for the ascertainment of tariff facts.

THE REPUBLICAN TARIFF IDEA.

Mark the difference. President Taft in his letter of acceptance on August 1, 1912, said:

The American people may rest assured that should the Republican Party be restored to power in all legislative branches all the schedules in the present tariff of which complaint is made will be subjected to investigation and report by a competent and impartial tariff board, and to the reduction or change which may be necessary to square the rates with the facts.

Let us carry the contrast a little further. In your party platform at Baltimore you declared against the constitutional right of the Federal Government to impose or collect tariff duties except for the purpose of revenue. You denounced the Republican tariff system and appealed "to the American people to support us in our demand for a tariff for revenue only." The Republican platform adopted at Chicago, on the other hand, declared for protection as usual, and for information that—

can best be obtained by an expert commission as to the large volume of useful facts contained in the recent report of the Tariff Board.

The following quotation from the Republican platform is highly illuminating at the present time:

The pronounced feature of modern industrial life is its enormous diversification. To apply tariff rates justly to these changing conditions requires closer study and more scientific methods than ever before. The Republican Party has shown by its creation of a Tariff Board its recognition of this situation and its determination to be equal to it. We condemn the Democratic Party for its failure either to provide funds for the continuance of this board or to make some other provision for securing the information requisite for intelligent tariff legislation. We protest against the Democratic method of legislating on these vitally important subjects without careful investigation.

CUTTING DOWN OUR INDUSTRIES.

Thus the issue was joined upon which the campaign of 1912 was fought out. Your candidate, observing the destruction of the Republican Tariff Board, "knew his ground." We promised to restore that Tariff Board in order that the President and the Congress might ascertain the facts upon which to base the legislation which would bring sufficient revenue into the Treasury to run the country without internal taxes. But your President, who knew his mind, and who said your platform was "not molasses to catch flies," was not convinced. He "knew his ground" when he came into the House of Representatives on the 8th of April, 1913, to deliver his first message from the "throne." He held the same views then that he held when he was a candidate. He was not yet prepared

to "flop" on the question of the Tariff Commission, for with respect to the situation he then said:

Only new principles of action will save us from a final hard crystallization of monopoly and a complete loss of the influences that quicken enterprise and keep independent energy alive. It is plain what those principles must be. We must abolish everything that bears even the semblance of privilege or of any kind of artificial advantage, and put our business men and producers under the stimulation of a constant necessity to be efficient, economical, and enterprising, masters of competitive supremacy, better workers and merchants than any in the world. Aside from the duties laid upon articles which we do not, and probably can not, produce, therefore, and the duties laid upon luxuries and merely for the sake of the revenues they yield, the object of the tariff duties henceforth laid must be effective competition, the whetting of American wits by contest with the wits of the rest of the world.

THE TRADE COMMISSION INCIDENT.

Your President, now enthroned in his high office, still did not change his mind. Experience in the raising of revenues, with the Treasury fast running low, even did not make him change his mind, for out yonder at Indianapolis a year or so ago the President made another address, in which he told of the effectiveness of the Democratic tariff for revenue system. That was the address in which he reminded the country that the Republican Party had had no new ideas for 30 years, and was competent only "to sit upon the lid." That was when he told the country that in this matter of exercising jurisdiction over the tariff rates he had "put one over us" on the Republican side by "slipping into" the Trade Commission bill a provision which gave it ample powers.

We had been told in a discussion in the House, and we knew it for a fact, that in abolishing the Republican Tariff Board the Democratic Party relied for its influence upon the Bureau of Interstate and Foreign Commerce, which it created as an excuse for abolishing the Bureau of Manufactures. The claim upon your side then was that you had full authority to ascertain tariff facts. You reiterated your claim under your trade-commission bill, and the President reasserted it yonder in Indianapolis; but it must be recalled that neither you nor he had then prepared to flop.

SPEECH AT INDIANAPOLIS.

In that remarkable speech at Indianapolis, the President, speaking of the "scientific handling of the tariff question," said:

That kind of science I do not care to know anything about, except enough to stop it. But if by scientific treatment of the tariff they mean adjustment to the actual trade conditions of America and the world, then I am with them; and I want to call their attention—for though they voted for it they apparently have not noticed it—to the fact that the bill which creates the new Trade Commission does that very thing. We were at pains to see that it was put in there. That commission is authorized and empowered to inquire into and report to Congress not only upon all the conditions of trade in this country, but upon the conditions of trade, the cost of manufacture, the cost of transportation—all the things that enter into the question of the tariff—in foreign countries as well as in the United States, and into all those questions of foreign combinations which affect international trade between Europe and the United States. It has the full powers which will guide Congress in the scientific treatment of questions of international trade.

It was not thought necessary, even for political purposes, to change front on the "scientific" and "efficiency" tariff platform at that time. Assured Democratic methods were good enough. The administration had ample authority to do as it pleased.

WHO "PUT ONE OVER"?

"Full powers." Why, if you did not have it before, this provision that the President suggests was "put over us" on this side of the House in the passage of the trade commission bill gave you ample power. The President asserted it and reasserted it. He "knew his ground." But—

Being by profession a schoolmaster—

He says—

I am glad to point that out to a class of uninstructed Republicans, though I have not always taught in the primary grade.

No, sir; the President was no novice at this tariff business. It was not new to him. He was "a schoolmaster" who had taught yonder at Princeton; he had told the boys about it, and they believed it.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa and Mr. ADAMSON rose.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Yes; I will yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. ADAMSON. I just wanted to say, Mr. Chairman—

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. If the gentleman from Georgia will pardon me, the gentleman from Pennsylvania yielded to me.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I will gladly yield to the gentleman from Georgia in a moment.

Mr. ADAMSON. And I will yield to the gentleman from Iowa, and with pleasure.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. The President uses the expression that the Republicans, though they voted for it, did not know it. As I remember that matter, when the provision was considered

by the House there was an elaborate discussion. Am I not correct about it?

THE SCHOOLMASTER DEFENDED.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Yes. There was an elaborate discussion, and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] made a very strong speech on this proposition, in which it will be found that the gentleman from Minnesota, Mr. Stevens, had something to do with the introduction of that paragraph in the Trade Commission bill. And I think, if the record be brought forth, it will be found that the President had nothing to do with that provision, but claimed it on his arrival at Indianapolis.

Now I yield to my friend from Georgia.

Mr. ADAMSON. Mr. Chairman, the extended conversation between the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania and the equally distinguished gentleman from Iowa has removed me from the context where I wished to make a remark to the gentleman. [Laughter.] Was the gentleman alluding to the fact that our distinguished Executive was the schoolmaster? If so, I wish to remind him of the old adage that the schoolmaster is abroad in the land, and to remember that on election day he will be still more prevalent in the land. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. If that is the opinion down in Georgia, I fear it does not prevail throughout the country; but the President will probably know more about it when he returns from the stumping tour he is now conducting with the view of convincing the people differently.

Mr. ADAMSON. Oh, the gentleman need not be timorous.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The gentleman from Georgia has more fear than the gentleman from Pennsylvania has. I think the discussion has become so hot at this particular point that the gentleman from Georgia will probably not pursue the discussion further.

THINKS THE PRESIDENT WILL BE REELECTED.

Mr. ADAMSON. Will the gentleman yield again?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Yes; of course.

Mr. ADAMSON. I want to say to my friend that my fears are all imaginary, and not like those on his part; and I have not only hope but faith, which is the substance of things hoped for. And I am not like the old negro preacher whom the genial gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HEFLIN] speaks about, who preached a sermon at the funeral of a friend of somewhat doubtful life, and said, "I do not know much about my friend, this old nigger, but I hope he has gone where I am afraid he aint." [Laughter.]

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I think I can say to the gentleman, paraphrasing Mr. HEFLIN's story, to which he has made such happy allusion, that I have heard of instances where even a Georgian could go awry as a political prophet. I think that confidence in the future which the gentleman professes is not indulged by Democracy generally, and particularly not by the Representatives upon this side of the House.

BUILDING UP AGAINST REPUBLICANS.

Mr. Chairman, we were discussing the manner in which the President and the Democratic Party had built up their case against the Republican tariff board. They had reached that point where they had no hesitancy about asserting the completeness and the efficiency of their laws to administer the tariff as they saw fit and as they thought would produce the revenue necessary to run the country. But now the sad second chapter of that story may be opened up in a reference to the financial figures, which, after all, are the best test of the efficiency of an administration. The whole issue between the Republicans and the Democrats in the last campaign was as to the method of raising revenue. We contended that it should be raised by taxing the foreigner upon the goods he sent into the United States, thus protecting American labor and American business men by keeping wages high here and not compelling them to go to the foreign level. We contended that we could raise this revenue at the customhouses, and that it would relieve the people of the burden of internal taxation, such as income tax and a war tax, and things of that kind, which the Democrats have been forced to resort to in order to save their faces. And we could have done so, but the people believed the prophets of the economic evil that was to come.

THE CHANGE ON THE SURFACE.

From day to day, under the Democratic system, the Treasury reports show that the tariff-for-revenue policy initiated by the President, and which he stood for even up to his Indianapolis speech, was not effective; on the contrary, it forced internal taxation, forced heavy burdens upon the backs of the people, and took away the employment of hundreds of thousands under the operation of the law despite the accident of the

European war. But, Mr. Chairman, "the proof of the pudding," even though distasteful, "is in the eating of it," and over the surface of the Democratic moon has come a change. The tariff-for-revenue system is not productive, and the President has come to view the situation in a different light than that which illumined his thought in that rather chipper speech at Indianapolis. The Secretary of Commerce, that Secretary who probably wrote the word "efficiency" in the President's first message delivered here from "the throne"—that Secretary who seemed to think we could live upon bookkeeping in this country.

BOOKKEEPING AND TAXES.

Bookkeeping and formality and supervision which even the smallest employer of labor might comprehend as readily as the greatest corporation; that Secretary who was keeping in touch with the Treasury conditions, and who had taken a good deal of the burden of the criticism of the administration, had begun to recognize, in his public utterances at least, that all the harm which business felt was overtaking it was not seriously intended. Cognizant, doubtless, of the recommendations of the Secretary of the Treasury in favor of new forms of internal taxation, the Secretary of Commerce came forward with a statement of the customs revenues which was most alarming. The administration may have "known its ground" on the tariff question, and it may have stood to its guns, but the last horn was about to blow. In a confidential statement to the newspapers, released January 20, Mr. Secretary Redfield, of the Department of Commerce, said:

Decreased customs revenues in the fiscal year 1915 clearly reflect the influence of war.

Ah, when it comes to political economy and the issue between the two great parties, how imposing is the influence of the European war! The European war, it "is but to laugh"! The damage was done before the European war opened. The great loss of employment involving hundreds of thousands; the great loss to business, involving billions of dollars in this country, were all effected before the first shot was fired over yonder in Belgium territory; but the Secretary, like all loyal Democrats, holds to the apology. It is the easiest way out.

LOSSES BEFORE THE WAR.

But the Secretary says:

The influence of war, which operated to cut off imports generally, and especially merchandise from Europe, the leading sources of dutiable goods, and then our customs revenues in 1914—

Says the Secretary of Commerce, the efficiency expert of the administration—

amounted to \$283,700,000, a decrease of \$28,700,000, or less than 10 per cent, when compared with 1913. In the following year, under war, they fell to \$205,800,000, being \$78,700,000, or 27½ per cent below the total for 1914.

Is it any wonder they were disturbed about revenues, with free imports piling up apace? The Secretary was not speaking of imports which came in free, and which have continued throughout the war to compete with American goods and American labor. He was not telling us of the inrush of foreign-made goods despite the war and during the war in foreign countries, that kept flooding our shores, from which no revenue was being derived. He was just telling us of the dead-cold loss in dollars and cents that was resulting from the continued attempt to establish a tariff-for-revenue policy on such goods as did pay and that policy was breaking down. [Applause on the Republican side.]

There was a loss of 10 per cent in revenues in 1913, but the President was not yet scared. He was not yet ready to flop; but in 1914, when the figures were all brought to the front, and it was found that the loss during that year was not 10 per cent, but 27½ per cent in revenues, then the President began to think, and then he began to send for the Democratic leaders, and then he began to talk to the big interests of the country as well as to the little interests and tell them to be still.

CALMING THE TURBULENT SPIRITS.

It was time to stop the storm that was brewing. After the President had told the people that their trouble was only "psychological" he began to tell them to be at ease and peace with the world; that the business interests need give themselves no concern. Even the Attorney General told them that, under the inspiration of the chambers of commerce of the United States. Apparently the great Democratic leader was getting ready to flop; the bare, cold, financial facts were so dead against him that it became necessary to go to the country with some sort of a program and endeavor to explain the situation.

The President is now on his journey; he will tell his story to the people. But wait a minute! Before he left the Capital, and we have the newspaper reports of this morning to prove it,

there was a conference of Democratic leaders at the White House. The President sent for the Democratic leader of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KIRCHIN], and in consequence of that interview we have the declaration this morning that the new policy upon which the administration is about to embark includes legislation for a tariff commission on lines similar to the Republican tariff commission that was destroyed by the Democratic Party when it came into this House. We are to have a Democratic tariff commission despite the fact that we have a Democratic Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, which was to supply the needs of a tariff board, and totally unmindful of the creation of an expensive Federal Trade Commission, into whose organic law the President, at Indianapolis, indicated there had been slipped a provision giving the administration ample power to make the investigation and reports desired.

ARE THE DEMOCRATS UNITED?

Has the President flopped in making this declaration? And in flopping has he carried the entire Democracy with him? My distinguished friend from Georgia [Mr. ADAMSON] seems to think that the Democrats will stand unitedly behind the President upon this proposition. Why, Mr. Chairman, we had some evidence of how unitedly they stand together upon any proposition in the discussion of the child-labor bill upon this floor yesterday. We had an evidence of the manner in which they will stand together upon any proposition, when we discussed the good-roads bill for three or four days, and found them beautifully disunited, some for economy and some for expenditure, some for the President and some against.

So, with reference to the tariff commission, we find in the declaration of the leading Democratic paper of the city of Philadelphia, and one of the best in the country, this explanation of the interview between the President of the United States and the Democratic House leader; somewhat reluctant methinks, to discuss the problem with his chief.

THE PANIC (?) OF 1907.

Mr. HOWARD. Will my friend from Pennsylvania yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania yield to the gentleman from Georgia?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I will yield.

Mr. HOWARD. I hold in my hand a statement from a Republican paper in which it gives the increase of wages of thousands of wage earners in this country from plate glass to cotton mills, a voluntary increase from 5 to 20 per cent. This is the first time I have known of a voluntary raise of wages. Can the gentleman give any reason why these great industrial plants have increased wages when there are such depressed conditions as he speaks of?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Certainly I can. I will not run away from the question put by the gentleman, but before answering him I would like to ask the gentleman if the increase in the lines that he gives with respect to employment and increases of wages, prevailed during the pendency of the Underwood tariff law, from October 13, 1913, until August 1, 1914, when the war broke out in Europe? [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. HOWARD. In reply to the gentleman, I will say that neither did they exist in 1907 when I saw 30,000 men in Pittsburgh walking the streets begging for bread. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. That is fine. I expected that some Democrat would applaud, and I see that three did applaud. That panic of 1907 is the only thread that the Democrats have to hang their hats upon, and that was not a tariff panic. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. HOWARD. I want to say to my friend in reply—

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Did not that great trouble start with the Knickerbocker Trust Co. in New York, a financial institution? And have not the Democrats cited it ever since as a tariff panic when as a fact the tariff had absolutely nothing to do with it? Will the gentleman from Georgia answer that, and will the Democrats applaud his answer?

Mr. HOWARD. One thing I can not explain—

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I know the gentleman can not, and that is the trouble. [Laughter on the Republican side.]

A CONTRAST OF TARIFF CONDITIONS.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania yield further to the gentleman from Georgia?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I am glad to yield. I think this is a subject on which the country ought to be enlightened and its memory refreshed. It is the richest morsel that the Democrats ever got hold of although it is entirely apart from the tariff question.

Mr. HOWARD. I am very much interested in what the gentleman from Pennsylvania says, for he is one of the few Representatives who is always pleasant, and because he is always so fair. I would like to ask him if he believes that the Underwood tariff bill was responsible for the conditions in 1914 when it never went into full operation in that year, and does he believe that the Payne-Aldrich tariff bill would have produced any more revenue?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Oh, yes. I will answer the gentleman, and I want the indulgence of the House while I do it. For months prior to the passage of the Underwood bill there was fear and dread throughout the whole length and breadth of the land in all business circles, and particularly where labor was employed.

WHY THERE WAS STAGNATION.

It was believed there would be such a slash in the industries of the country as to practically put them out of business. Men everywhere who had capital invested, who had pay rolls to make good, who had to meet workmen face to face were perturbed; everywhere these men were beginning to retrench, preparing, as it were, for the disaster which they expected to come. And long before the bill was actually enacted into law mills were closing up, men going out of employment, because the new conditions were to be so harsh and unfavorable that ordinary common sense dictated self-preservation of business and fireside. When finally the law was enacted most of the damage had been done. It continued, however, with unabated fury until the expiration of nine months after the passage of the law, when there was a loss of billions in the business in the country. Other countries began to pick up in their industries. They were taking courage out of our misfortunes and our markets were opened to them. I do not exaggerate when I say that workmen began to leave the United States and obtain employment in Canada and Europe, while men at home began to walk the streets.

It is absolutely true, and I am glad the gentleman has given me an opportunity to answer, that our imports were increased. At the same time the exports were falling off at such a rate that it was bringing distress and wretchedness to our farms as well as to our industries, and it was mighty fortunate that the administration, responsible for bringing it about, had the European war to fall back upon when the crash came.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Will the gentleman yield?

NO PROTECTION FROM DUMPING.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania yield to the gentleman from Washington?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I do.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Is it not a fact that millions of dollars worth of goods were dumped on American markets immediately after the passage of the tariff bill, putting a great many factories out of business?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. That is absolutely true, and although the Democrats had an antidumping clause originally in their bill, they took it out. To-day, however, we hear that along with their proposition to give us a tariff board they propose to restore the antidumping clause to save that situation.

Mr. HOWARD. Will the gentleman yield for one more question?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Yes.

Mr. HOWARD. If that statement of the gentleman is true, why is it that the American products to-day are selling as high as they ever sold in our country?

WHEN PEOPLE STOP BUYING.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Because—and it is well for the gentleman to know this—the war in Europe did not have everything to do with it, as the gentleman thinks. It was by reason of that fear and dread in the industrial world in anticipation and due to the actual operation of the Underwood tariff law that men ceased to manufacture, men ceased to buy; the country merchants did not come to town, the purchasing agents went out of business, and everything ran down to bedrock.

It will be recalled that merchants ran out of stock, mills were not making anything, we were down at the heel, and the time had come when some of the importations from the foreign countries having been checked by reason of the war, we had begun to manufacture again. We had run out and had to start again. The industries picked up, to be sure. But that is not all; the cotton industry in the South got very busy after its panic of 6½ cents, and the people began to discuss manufacturing cotton in the United States, which was encouraged here during the war, when cotton was kept out of Germany, as it was never encouraged by the Democratic Party in normal times. And then, again munitions of war were demanded of the United States, and the industries began making munitions

of war; that gave men employment. Good wages were paid, because we got back from Europe a good deal of our money; but I am afraid it is no compliment to the Democratic Party to say that the prosperity that has come from the manufacture of munitions of war is a real or substantial prosperity. That kind of prosperity will go just as soon as the war in Europe closes; it will be all over then; and when it is over God help the United States if we must still operate under the Democratic low-tariff law. [Applause on the Republican side.]

RAISES THE IMMIGRATION QUESTION.

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Certainly.

Mr. HOWARD. As I understand the gentleman, of course he is in favor of the importation of foreigners to this country, for he has always voted against any immigration bill.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I have made myself clear on that. I have opposed the literacy test, which is not a test of morality, which is no test of the capacity of a man to work, which is no test of his readiness to labor in the United States for a better position for himself under our laws and Constitution. That is all.

Mr. HOWARD. The gentleman believes in free trade so far as labor is concerned?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Not at all. We have much restrictive immigration law which I approve.

Mr. HOWARD. But a high tariff so far as the products of labor are concerned?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. As to the products of foreign labor competing with the products of American labor, yes.

Mr. HOWARD. That is the gentleman's record.

ILLITERACY NOT IMMORAL.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I have voted against the literacy test, but when you bring a bill in here that has so many problems involved in it that no one can vote for or against the literacy test without voting the bill up or down I would rather take the safe side of the question and vote against the bill than to punish innocent and deserving human flesh and blood. I have contended that we ought to give the worthy and law-abiding immigrant a chance for his "white alley" in the United States. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. HOWARD. Will the gentleman yield again?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Yes.

Mr. HOWARD. Would not the gentleman vote against any bill that would even tend to restrict foreign immigration to this country, no matter of what class?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Not necessarily. I would vote for an immigration bill that proposes to keep out anarchists or other trouble makers. But that, as the gentleman knows, is already covered by law. Why, of course, I would vote to keep out the criminal, the unfit, the dissolute—

Mr. HOWARD. But that is the law now.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I know it is the law, and the new thing in the bill that you have presented to us and ask us to vote for, and which is the matter of difference, puts against the foreigner who is willing to toil and behave as a useful citizen in this country, a bar, because he can not read or write. I say reading is no moral test; it is no test of the worth of a man; the forefathers of many of us possibly came into this country unable to read or write. The question is one of humanity, of conserving human flesh and blood.

A HINT AT ONE TERM.

Mr. SLOAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. SLOAN. I trust the gentleman will not close his admirable speech until he says something more on the subject of flopping. We heard the authoritative statement on this floor, for the first time I think, that the next to the last plank of the Baltimore platform should be repealed. This is an announcement in the form of a prediction that the present Executive will succeed himself—a repeal and repudiation of that historic plank. The prediction of the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations [Mr. Flood] announcing the most modern flop either of the Executive or the platform itself on the second-term proposition must be authoritative. It should find a place in the gentleman's speech.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The gentleman, as I observed a moment ago, not intending to interrupt him in the course of his question, is a mind reader, for he knows exactly what I was about to say.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Yes.

Mr. HILL. Has the gentleman forgotten the emphatic declaration contained in a letter to Col. Evans, in Philadelphia, by the President of the United States as to the sufficiency of the trade commission?

THOUGHT TRADE COMMISSION SUFFICIENT.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The President of the United States did write a letter to Mr. Evans, of Philadelphia, expressing entire confidence in the sufficiency of the tariff clauses of the trade commission bill; but of course this was before the flop of the day before yesterday.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Yes.

Mr. LONGWORTH. I will ask the gentleman if he will be good enough to read section 3 of the bill which I introduced early in December, it being the bill which in 1913 passed both Houses of Congress, with a solid Republican vote, to provide for a tariff commission. If he will read section 3, which provides for the duties of that board, he will see whether there is any difference whatever between that and what the President of the United States recommends to-day in his letter to Mr. KITCHIN.

LIKE THE LONGWORTH BILL.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I think, without reading it carefully, because I do not want to consume the time, that everything contained in this paragraph is contained in the President's newest suggestion. The President is a schoolmaster, as he stated in his Indianapolis speech, and it is just possible that he or some of his friends may have seen this Republican provision before they made their Democratic suggestion.

Mr. LONGWORTH. I think it will be worth while for the gentleman to read that section into his speech. It is short.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Very well, I will take the gentleman's word for it. This is a bill introduced by Mr. LONGWORTH on December 6, 1915, being H. R. 154, to create a tariff commission. Section 3 reads as follows:

SEC. 3. That it shall be the duty of said commission to investigate the cost of production of all articles which by any act of Congress now in force or hereafter enacted are made the subject of tariff legislation, with special reference to the prices paid domestic and foreign labor and the prices paid for raw materials, whether domestic or imported, entering into manufactured articles, producers' prices and retail prices of commodities, whether domestic or imported, the condition of domestic and foreign markets affecting the American products, including detailed information with respect thereto, together with all other facts which may be necessary or convenient in fixing import duties or in aiding the President and other officers of the Government in the administration of the custom laws, and said commission shall also make investigation of any such subject whenever directed by either House of Congress.

In commenting on that, I want to say that while this bill is the work of Mr. LONGWORTH, my colleague from Ohio, it has an extremely familiar sound, and since the utterance from the White House as published to-day sounds just as deep-dyed Republican as it does Democratic, showing how great minds work along, after all, in the same groove.

ABANDONED, NOT FLOPPED.

I was saying a moment ago when interrupted by some one that there was a grave question of doubt as to whether the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. ADAMSON] was accurate in his statement that all the Democrats would stand behind the President, and that as a result of his tour of the country it would be found that with one voice they would rise up and demand the reelection of Mr. Wilson.

The Democratic Philadelphia Record, from which I started to quote, the leading exponent of its party in the great Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, a hornet in the side of Republicans, and which has a very bright man obtaining its news from the White House and sending it over to Philadelphia every day, has this to say with respect to this phase of Democratic unity:

In proposing the creation of an independent board to investigate customs methods and tariff needs and report its recommendations to Congress along the lines described on December 8—

It does not say "flopped"—

the President has abandoned the project most favored by him for the present project.

CHANGING BY DEGREES.

Now, the President was once for one project, but he has "abandoned" that project, and now he is for another project; but it is explained without using the word the gentleman from Texas unfortunately threw into this discussion a little while ago—the offensive word "flopped"—that—

He was then of the opinion that the tariff could be divorced from political influences by expanding the powers of the Foreign and Domestic Trade Bureau of the Department of Commerce.

That is when he held the other view—the view entertained at the time he made the Indianapolis speech.

This plan—

Says the Record—

was favored at the time by Secretary of the Treasury McAdoo and Secretary Redfield, who, in common with a number of the President's other advisers, opposed the suggestion to confer the necessary powers to initiate tariff revision upon the Federal Trade Commission.

COMMISSION DID NOT MEASURE UP.

Apparently there were three steps in this transaction: First, the abolition of the Republican Tariff Board; second, the creation of the Democratic Interstate and Foreign Commerce Bureau; and then a Democratic Federal Trades Commission. But the writer continues:

This commission, according to Democratic leaders, has not fulfilled the expectations that prompted its creation.

This is the one, as the President observed at Indianapolis, he put over on us. Now, it does not appear to be satisfactory. Something further is needed:

The new plan will segregate the tariff in the proposed board. In this way it is the belief of the President—

Perhaps this method is a little more "psychological"; may be a little more efficient. If we could "segregate" the tariff from Congress through the proposed board, we might get another start and fool the people a third or fourth time. "Segregation" might then take the place so lately occupied by "psychological." The new plan will segregate the tariff in the proposed board. Says the writer:

In this way, it is the belief of the President, his aim to perfect the Underwood tariff law purely upon the basis of merit, and not because of political influences, can be best accomplished.

"PERFECTING" THE LOW-TARIFF LAW.

Note the language, "perfect the Underwood tariff law," as if from the Democratic viewpoint that law is not already perfect. But do not stop with "perfecting" the law. Bear in mind that this new tariff board which is to aid in perfecting the law is to be devoid of political influence. We are to have a tariff board appointed by a Democratic President, which is to deal with the tariff on merit and without regard to politics. That is at least helpful.

Now, here is something that I almost hesitate to read, although I think it ought to be read here, so the House can understand the inappropriateness of the suggestion of the gentleman from Georgia that all Democrats will stand together. It says:

Leader KITCHIN did not subscribe to this view—

That is to say, this segregation view—

during his talk with the President regarding it this morning.

This disclosure violates no rule of the House, because it is published in a newspaper, and I have a right to read it in my time.

Leader KITCHIN did not subscribe to this view during his talk with the President regarding it this morning—

Evidently the gentleman from North Carolina, who is now upon the floor, did not want to go into the segregation business so far as it affected the tariff. That is the statement of our distinguished friend from North Carolina as it is given here, and he, of course, may answer this in his own time if he so sees fit.

In fact, he asked to be relieved from the management of the measure on the ground that he had always opposed—

A SLIGHT DIFFERENCE BETWEEN LEADERS.

That is to say, it is now the second or third proposition that the President had after he had enunciated his suggestion that they knew where they stood and the platform was not made to "catch flies."

And Mr. KITCHIN asked to be relieved from the management of the measure on the ground that he had always opposed such a proposition.

He was consistent. The gentleman from North Carolina apparently did not "flop" on the question, and frankly told the President so.

That he had always opposed such a proposition in the past and had led the fight against President Taft's recommendation for such an institution in 1908.

There you have it. There is the position of one great leader on the Democratic side and another great leader on the Democratic side; one willing to flop and change several times and the other endeavoring to be consistent and stand his ground so that he might not be accused of being "molasses with which to catch flies." [Applause on the Republican side.]

But listen to this:

As a way out of this difficulty he suggested to the President that Congressman HENRY T. RAINY, of Illinois, who is the next ranking member of the Ways and Means Committee, be given charge of the legislation.

ILLINOIS SUPPLIES THE CHAMPION.

Now, there it is. Everyone who knows the amiable gentleman from Illinois knows that he is a determined advocate of the policy of tariff for revenue only; that he dislikes protection and

a tariff in general, though he has made himself a master of the subject. And what does Mr. RAINY do? According to this report, after it has been suggested that Mr. RAINY should relieve Mr. KITCHIN of the arduous task which the President was trying to impose upon the gentleman from North Carolina, this paper says:

The President assented and will have a talk with the Illinois Congressman in a day or so.

[Applause on the Republican side.]

And then we have it straight from the shoulder—

RAINY this afternoon indicated his readiness to undertake the commission.

So now, in the course of these rather desultory remarks upon a rather dry subject, we find that the leader of the Democracy in the House, our distinguished and eloquent friend from North Carolina, will not follow the President in the "about-face" movement with respect to a tariff board, but that gently but firmly he unloads upon the distinguished and forceful gentleman from Illinois, who, at the behest of the President, will take up the task. The Lord be with him! [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.]

DO THOSE WHO FLOP LEAD?

In conclusion, gentlemen, with respect to the suggestions thrown out by my friend from Texas [Mr. DIES], who continues to preside with grace and dignity over the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, I think it is fair to say that "he who flops will not always lead." [Applause on the Republican side.]

Why, Mr. Chairman, flopping is not new on the other side of the House. For instance, there was the flop on the plank written into the Democratic platform of Baltimore promising free tolls to American ships through the American-paid-for canal. That was a plank put there to stay until the day of judgment. It was not "molasses with which to catch flies." But we saw in due course that our Democratic friends came in with pallor on their faces, indicating that the President, after minute study of the international problems involved, had induced them, for the safety and preservation of the Nation, as they saw it, to vote against their own platform and charge Americans just as much as they charge any foreigners for using their own canal. And they did that to us good and hard. Then came the suggestion from the Democratic convention at Baltimore that the extravagance of a Republican Congress should be abolished and that Democratic simplicity of expenditure should prevail; and it came shortly thereafter out of the mouths of the Democratic leaders themselves, raising their hands to high heaven in expostulation against the aggrandizement of their own Members, unable to check their wild horses seeking appropriations, that their Congress had been the most extravagant in the history of the Nation, and there never had been anything like unto it during the administration of the Republican Party. [Applause on the Republican side.]

THE CONSISTENCY OF DEMOCRATS.

Mr. DAVIS of Texas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. DAVIS of Texas. Does not the gentleman know that universal consistency is the sole virtue of idiots?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I think that is the trouble with the Democratic Party. It is too infernally consistent on some questions and too inconsistent on others.

Mr. LENROOT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Yes.

Mr. LENROOT. I would like to ask the gentleman if he is in favor of a nonpartisan tariff commission?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. If you can find a nonpartisan tariff commission, I am in favor of it. [Applause.]

Mr. LENROOT. One other question—

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I think I can quote the Speaker of this House—

Mr. LENROOT. I would like to ask one other question.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, how much time have I remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. Six minutes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

RESERVING THE RIGHTS OF CONGRESS.

Mr. LENROOT. I would like to ask the gentleman if he is in favor of that kind of a tariff commission that the Republican side of this House has stood for in the past?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I have no objection to a tariff board that ascertains the facts and gives both the President and Congress such information as will enable them to properly adjust the tariff rates. I hope that answers the gentleman.

Mr. LENROOT. I would like an answer to my question.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I have answered the gentleman. The gentleman may differ as to the meaning of the term "board" or the term "commission." From my point of view there is very little difference between the two terms. As interpreted by the Republicans heretofore and the Democrats now, there is absolutely no difference. They propose, under the Constitution, to ascertain the facts and report to Congress, and let Congress attend to its business of fixing the rates.

Mr. LENROOT. I was in good faith—

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I know it.

IS A TARIFF BOARD NONPARTISAN?

Mr. LENROOT. I want to know the gentleman's position—whether he is in favor of the kind of legislation, with reference to a tariff commission or tariff board—it is immaterial which you call it—that the Republican side of this House has stood for and voted for?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I say to the gentleman this, that I am in favor of any kind of a board or commission that will ascertain the facts and send to the House the information that it is necessary for the House to have in order to exercise its constitutional duty of fixing the rates equitably.

Mr. LENROOT. Certainly. That answers my question.

Mr. WHEELER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Yes.

Mr. WHEELER. I desire to ask the gentleman if a law should be passed by which a tariff commission should be appointed, and it should be appointed by President Wilson, do you believe that our present tariff law would be very materially changed?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I scarcely think so, if it is what some gentlemen think it will be—a partisan commission, because it would be impossible for the President of the United States to appoint an impartial tariff board. It is not the history of the President of the United States that he has ever deviated from his party line. In every instance where he has appointed commissions—these expense-eating commissions, these revenue-burning commissions of recent date—he has appointed Democrats, and some of them have had trouble in finding something to do.

DEMOCRATIC APPROVAL OF REPUBLICAN BOARD.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I have only a few minutes.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I move that the gentleman have five minutes additional time.

Mr. ADAMSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman have five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. COOPER] asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania have five minutes additional time. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Now, will the gentleman permit me to read at this point, as I think it will be apropos here, an opinion by a very prominent Democrat of the Republican Tariff Board and its work?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. If the gentleman will keep within the five minutes.

WHEN THE CHEMICAL SCHEDULE WAS UP.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. It is very brief. In a speech which the gentleman, who is now Governor General of the Philippine Islands, made in this House—I refer to the Hon. Burton Harrison—on the 19th of February, 1912, being in charge of the chemical schedule of the Underwood tariff, he said:

But more than this, and in addition, the Democratic membership of the Committee on Ways and Means in the preparation of this bill has had the benefit of the report of the Tariff Board on Schedule A. [Applause.]

The report of the Tariff Board consists of a glossary of the paragraphs of the existing law and, in addition, an economic review of the chemical industry in the United States, in Canada, in France, in England, and in Germany. The members of the Ways and Means Committee take this opportunity of expressing to the Tariff Board their appreciation of the very valuable assistance which this report has been to them in the preparation of their bill.

That is a strong Democratic indorsement of the work of the Republican Tariff Board which they, however, saw fit to abolish for purely partisan reasons.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin for reminding the House of that very interesting statement.

GATHERING THE FACTS FOR CONGRESS.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Yes.

Mr. HILL. I will remind the gentleman that that is but an informal opinion of one member of the committee, but if the

gentleman will examine the report on the Underwood bill I think he will find a distinct repudiation of all those statements in the action taken on the part of the Senate and on the part of the House, that they did not utilize that information in making up the tariff law.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I think, however, that does not affect the statement read by the gentleman from Wisconsin, which places on record the thoughts that were uppermost in the minds of the chairmen of some of the subcommittees of the Committee on Ways and Means bringing the tariff bill into the House; that without the information presented by the Republican Tariff Board they would have been at sea in fixing the various schedules.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman permit another interruption?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Yes.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. They brought in, in two consecutive years, two chemical schedules, one of them purely ad valorem and the other its opposite in principle, based upon specific duties.

GOOD WORK OF REPUBLICAN POLICIES.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Yes, Mr. Chairman; another flop. The gentleman from Wisconsin is clear and he is right. Not only did they bring in two bills on the chemical schedule, but they also brought in various bills on various other schedules, testing out and experimenting with the prosperity of the United States. And if any Democrat finds fault to-day with any of us for reminding them of those things, let it be said in the interest of the people of the United States that, having brought them up under a Republican system of protection as to tariff rates, which imposed the burden of taxation upon the foreign manufacturers of competing commodities, and having brought the country into a condition of happiness and domestic felicity such as it had never known before, we rightfully resent the intrusion upon that prosperity the experimentation of schoolmasters and others who, by reason of their undermining legislative practices, dragged it down and put the country for a time in the very lowest depths of industrial despair. [Applause on the Republican side.]

FINE ASSORTMENT OF FLOPS.

Now, as to this matter of the text furnished by the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES], who presides over the committee, we have observed that there was a flop on the Panama Canal question. We have also observed that there was a flop on the question of extravagance, and we all know there was a complete flop and breach of promise in the matter of the reduction of the high cost of living, because the cost of living has gone up and soared higher and higher since the Democrats have been in power.

There was also a breaking of the promise to the people that the Democratic Party would relieve them of the burden of taxation, because instead of taking off the burden of taxation they have put on additional burdens, large and small, on the people as individuals and otherwise, and they have put upon business such a system of inquisition and such a system of commission government as was never known before. They have piled up war taxes and stamp taxes such as would not have been tolerated under a Republican system. They have flopped upon every pledge that they made in the platform adopted at Baltimore—sugar, the trusts, the tariff, and all—because their policies, social, domestic, economic, and financial, were wrong. The effect of their failure has proven the absolute righteousness of the Republican system of protection and of the Republican system of building up and sustaining the industries of the country.

THE SINGLE-TERM PLANK.

But in still another platform plank have they made a breach; on another plank has the distinguished Democratic President and party leader made a flop. It was not made when his letter of acceptance of the Democratic national nomination and platform was written. It was not made known until a few weeks ago, when the political situation became so acute that the public had to be informed whether the President of the United States would again be a candidate for office or not.

Democracy knows, Republicanism knows, every man who reads the newspapers knows, and certainly everyone who reads the Commoner knows that the one-term plank put into the Democratic national platform was not "molasses intended to catch flies." That plank meant business. There was a gentleman out in Nebraska who wrote that platform with malice aforethought. [Laughter.] The President knew what that political plank was. There was a suggestion, formerly made, that some one out in Nebraska was to be "knocked into a cocked hat," but instead of

being "knocked into a cocked hat," he was taken into camp as a member of the Cabinet. But he did not stay in long; the one-term plank was burning a hole in his ambition, and he wanted to come out and talk to the people about it; he is now endeavoring to convince the people of the country that the one-term plank was right.

DISAPPOINTING MR. BRYAN.

But the Democratic President was not in accord with the gentleman from Nebraska on the one-term idea. He said little about it, but a long time ago he wrote to a distinguished Democrat and former Congressman in this House, Mr. A. Mitchell Palmer, his views on the one-term situation. He thought the people should determine such a question as Mr. Bryan wrote into the Baltimore platform. Why did we not get that letter a year ago? Why was it kept in Mr. Palmer's pocket from that time down until this? Why did not the President authorize Mr. Palmer to publish that letter so that the country might have a clean-cut understanding of his position? Perhaps some Democrat will tell us. We got the letter only a couple of weeks ago. In that letter we find discussed certain matters of public policy and political insight which induced the President, having served one term, to leave it up to the people as to whether he shall be elected a second term.

PRESIDENT DID NOT PLEDGE.

Here is the last breach in the Democratic platform. We can not blame the President for it, because in no published word can we find any acceptance by him of the suggestion that the one-term plank met with his approval. The Commoner lost no opportunity to let the country know where it stood upon this important matter both before and after the Baltimore convention. It had small regard for the man who would run upon a platform and not abide by its terms. But Mr. Wilson, the Democratic nominee, was not baited. His letter of acceptance might be scanned from start to finish without revealing a thought or line upon the plank that laid so close to the heart of the Commoner's distinguished editor. The letter to Mr. Palmer, the publication of which was long deferred, was the first inkling of the President's disbelief in the amiable thought of his erstwhile Secretary of State. It was the last "flop," not so much on the part of the President as on the part of those devoted followers of Mr. Bryan, who have been persuaded that the Democratic platform was in error when it sought to limit the tenure of a President to a single term.

WHEN REPUBLICANS COME BACK.

And now, Mr. Chairman, accepting the text of the eloquent gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES], let me suggest to our friends on the other side that they may continue to "flop" among themselves to their hearts' content. Upon this side we are standing pat upon the Republican doctrine of protection and prosperity to the Nation, which we hope to restore when a consistent Republican administration again takes up the reins of office. [Applause on the Republican side.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. RAINEY rose and was recognized.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, as a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, I want to speak only five or ten minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state to the gentleman from Wisconsin that he recognized the gentleman from Illinois before the gentleman from Wisconsin indicated his desire to speak.

Mr. RAINEY. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I am a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, entitled to the floor in my own right, but I do not care to exercise that right now.

Mr. RAINEY. Mr. Chairman, I can understand the difficulties under which a standpat Republican like the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] labors in his attempt, even in an hour and five minutes, to discredit the President of the United States. And I want to say to the gentleman, who is an expert along that line, that he can throw as much mud at the President as he pleases; it will have no more effect upon the President and upon his policies, and upon the things he stands for in this country and before the world than the gentleman could accomplish by throwing mud at the Washington Monument. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Speaking of flopping, I wonder if the gentleman from Pennsylvania is going to flop? I wonder if gentlemen on that side are going to flop? Let me read from the campaign platform adopted by the last national Republican convention, upon which

gentlemen on that side of the aisle were elected and upon which they have been pretending to stand:

The pronounced feature of modern industrial life is its enormous diversification. To apply tariff rates justly to these changing conditions requires closer study and more scientific methods than ever before. The Republican Party has shown by its creation of a tariff board its recognition of this situation and its determination to be equal to it. We condemn the Democratic Party for its failure either to provide funds for the continuance of this board or to make some other provision for securing the information requisite for intelligent tariff legislation. We protest against the Democratic method of legislating on these vitally important subjects without careful investigation.

Now, that is the Republican position. That is the platform you will all stand on if you do not flop when this matter is presented to you soon. I understand from the position taken by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] that he objects to the creation now of a nonpartisan tariff board, for the reason that the Democrats are in control, and for that reason it can not be nonpartisan; and then he proceeds to show that upon this question Democratic leaders are not united. He proceeds to prove that our proposition is not partisan.

I want to say concerning the report made by our distinguished former colleague in this House, Mr. Harrison, of New York, now Governor General of the Philippine Islands, that those bills which formed the nucleus of the Underwood tariff bill, and which were framed in the Sixty-second Congress, were all based on the reports of President Taft's tariff board, and we sent some of those bills clear on up to President Taft, and demonstrating this lack of consistency in the Republican Party, he vetoed them. Yet every one of them could be defended by simply calling attention to the collection of facts and data appearing in the reports of that special tariff board.

Now, I want to say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] that I know the kind of a tariff commission he wants. He does not propose to stand on this Republican national platform. He proposes to stand upon the platform recently announced by his leader, the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania, who in his speech before the New England Club, of Providence, R. I., on the 16th day of October, 1915, defined his position, and speaking for the gentleman who has just taken his seat [Mr. MOORE], evidently also defined his position. He said:

First get back a protective tariff, and then select a permanent tariff commission.

That is the platform upon which Republican partisans upon that side, blinded by partisanship, stand in this economic crisis of our history as a Nation. That is the kind of a nonpartisan tariff commission they want now.

Here is the way some of the rest of these distinguished Republican leaders and certain Republican journals now stand. Every one of them flops from this platform declaration of theirs which I have just read, and here is the kind of a platform they stand on now. Here is an expression from the Manufacturers' News, last October:

The tariff commission idea has whiskers. Political pressure would rule. The tariff can not be taken out of politics. The proposed commission would delay for two years a tariff revision.

Here is what the Hartford (Conn.) Courant said in September, 1915:

It would be difficult to have a nonpartisan tariff commission. A tariff commission works in Germany because there is no dispute as to the protection principle there.

Here is the kind of a platform to which they have flopped from the national Republican platform of two years ago, as expressed by the Muncie (Ind.) National Republican:

If the tariff is taken out of politics, it will be when free traders cease firing on the American policy. We favor a tariff commission when there has been a prompt upward revision of the tariff after the inauguration of another protectionist President.

Here is what the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. HAYES] said recently in the American Economist of August 20, 1915. This is how he has flopped from the nonpartisan tariff-commission expressions of his Republican platform:

I am not in favor of such a commission as would be appointed by the free trader now in the White House.

The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HUTCHINSON] about the same time, in fact in the same issue of the American Economist, said:

The people want the Republican Party to revise the tariff. There are too many commissions.

Here is what the distinguished Senator from Washington, Senator JONES, said on August 13, 1915:

I am in favor of a commission to revise the tariff on a protective standard.

Here is what the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Moore], who has just taken his seat, said on the 6th day of August, 1915, in the American Economist:

The question can not be answered until we find whether a non-partisan tariff commission is possible.

Here is what the American Economist said in July, 1915:

The tariff-commission idea is a fallacy. It is all right in Germany, because the policy of protection prevails there—

And so on.

That is the platform upon which Republicans stand now who are blinded by partisanship. That is how they have flopped from their own platform, adopted in their national convention at Chicago.

You can depend upon the President of the United States and upon the Democratic Party to stand always patriotically for the best interests of this country. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Does the gentleman who has just taken his seat realize the changed conditions which confront us now, the changed world conditions? Why, the Underwood tariff law had just commenced to work, it was yielding as much and more revenue than we expected it to yield, but suddenly there was a red glow in the eastern skies, and from out of the clouds of war a hand of iron reached and stopped the ships upon the seas, the ships that were bringing goods to our ports, the goods that were to pay the revenue under the Underwood tariff bill. Can the gentleman from Pennsylvania with all of his shrewd partisanship and unfair logic convince the country that the United States is responsible in any measure for that war? Talk as much as you may about the blood-streaked prosperity on this side of the water, who is responsible for prosperity of that kind? Talk about manufacturing munitions here in private plants, and shipping them across the seas to be used for the purpose of dealing out death on the battlefields of Europe, who is responsible for that? Why, the party which was in power for so many years and refused to build up Government munition factories in this country. That party is responsible for the trade in arms which is now possible. They can not charge us with that sort of business. Are men being killed on European battlefields by guns manufactured in America? Who made that possible? Why, the party that was in power when that business was built up throughout the country and which refused to establish Government plants for the manufacture of arms. That party must answer for it now and when the question is presented to the electorate next November.

Now, speaking of prosperity, I want to read from Republican journals something about what is going on in this country at the present time. I read from the Washington Post of October 25, always against the administration and always speaking for the Republican Party:

[From the Washington Post, Oct. 25.]

A WEEK OF IMMENSE TRANSACTIONS IN BUSINESS.

The week that has just closed has been a week of sensational advances in many stocks of industrial companies.

Among the large orders placed in this country during the past week may be mentioned one for railroad ties to the value of \$2,500,000.

The report of the General Chemical Co. for the quarter ended September 30 is an exhibit well up in the line with the prosperity reports of many big business concerns.

The net profits for the quarter were \$1,705,273, an increase over the preceding quarter of \$945,352.

During the nine months since January 1, 1915, the profits were \$4,058,741, an increase of \$1,872,734 as compared with the first nine months of 1914.

Exports of wheat from United States and Canadian ports during the past week broke all records, totaling 11,113,093 bushels.

For the 16 weeks ended October 21 corn exports were 3,426,689 bushels, as against but 1,861,040 bushels in the same period of last year.

Recently in the Chicago Drovers' Journal J. Ogden Armour, a better authority than the gentleman from Pennsylvania—and the gentleman will admit it himself—on commercial matters, on the question of prosperity in this country, gave out this authorized interview on the 11th of November, 1915. I read this interview in full:

UNITED STATES IN RECORD BOOM ERA, SAYS ARMOUR—AMERICA RISING RAPIDLY TO UNPRECEDENTED PROSPERITY, INCONCEIVABLE A YEAR AGO AND ENDURING, SAYS PACKER.

[From the Drovers Journal, Nov. 11, 1915.]

J. Ogden Armour, in an interview on crop, market, and financial conditions, said: "America is rapidly rising to an unprecedented prosperity, a prosperity which would have been inconceivable a year ago, and which will be enduring. It will be boomlike for, say, three years, and should not be affected by a termination of the European war within that time."

For a captain of industry, whose reticence, restraint, and conservatism are proverbial, the above declaration is interesting and instructive. "The idea that the cessation of European hostilities must affect us adversely is, I believe, academic," said Mr. Armour. "In the first

place, emigration from the countries now at war will be prohibited. They will be forced to take this step because the conflict means an exhaustion of men as well as of treasure. Men will be needed over there as much, if not more, than money. There can be no competition between a country of America's great vigor and infinite resources and countries that have spent themselves.

AMERICA TO LEAD.

"America was destined to lead the world commercially and financially in 15 years. The war simply hastened that manifest destiny. For an American to fear the aftermath of the war appears to me baseless."

The president of Armour & Co. then proceeded to give reasons for his unshakable optimism:

"Ours is not a war prosperity, although, to be sure, ammunition orders are accelerating the pace," he said. "It is fundamental, in that the products of the farm are the basis of it. We are still largely an agricultural community, and as agriculture prospers the whole country prospers."

"Look at our crops and the prices we are getting for them. Both have no parallel in the country's annals. Wheat was late in harvesting, but is now coming abundantly to market. The enormous daily exports show that the corn yield is bountiful. The run of hogs will be large."

EUROPE BUYING HEAVILY.

"The demand for these necessities is in proportion to their supply. Europe is buying as she has never bought before, and the swelling bank deposits reflect the heavy European payments as well as the affluence of the farmer."

"Take, for example, the National City Bank of New York" (of which Mr. Armour is a director). "A year ago the gross deposits of that institution were \$245,000,000. To-day they are more than \$500,000,000." (The shares of the institution have risen 150 points.)

"Bankers as a rule have been hard put by these startling increases. Rates are low, but the money will all be profitably employed. It is only a question of time, and the employment of so much money will mean just so much more prosperity."

"The South, which only a few months ago was in despair, is now, to speak colloquially, drunk with prosperity. Planters are finding no difficulty in marketing their cotton at good prices. That section of the country is fortunate, too, in enjoying a revival in the lumber trade. Timber in the South has advanced \$2 a thousand."

"I have no doubt that the Pacific coast, whose timber trade has been lagging, will soon thrive. In fact, every leading industry is flourishing or beginning to flourish. Building permits throughout the country are at a high mark. So it is with what might be called the luxurious or semiluxurious lines, such as jewelry and furniture. Our reports from Grand Rapids, the furniture manufacturing center, show that the factories are operating at full capacity."

RAILROADS ARE BAROMETERS.

It may be noted here in parentheses that the Armour organizations have unusual facilities for obtaining widespread and accurate statistics on current commercial conditions. The packing company, for example, has an agent in every city of consequence, while Mr. Armour himself is a director in several banks and in the Illinois Central and the St. Paul Railway system.

"Then," continued Mr. Armour, "there are the railway revenues. These are infallible indicators of trade tendencies. Earnings are increasing by leaps and bounds. There is a car shortage for the first time in five years. I know of western roads which could use double the cars they have at their disposal at present. In brief, we—the United States—are 'it' with a capital 'I' and will continue to be in that enviable position indefinitely."

From Dun's Weekly Review of Trade for the week ending November 12, which ought to be as good authority as the gentleman from Pennsylvania, who has just taken his seat, I read:

WEEKLY REVIEW OF TRADE.

NO SLACKENING IN SIGNS FORECASTING GREATEST COMMERCIAL DEVELOPMENT IN HISTORY, SAYS DUN—MILD WEATHER RETARDING RETAIL BUYING, BRADSTREET REPORTS.

NEW YORK, November 12.

R. G. Dun's weekly review of trade to-morrow will say:

There is no slackening of the advance that foreshadows the greatest commercial development in the history of the country.

Following many months of gradual recovery and adjustment to new conditions, progress has come with such a rush that reaction is feared in some quarters; yet the economic position steadily gains in strength, and seldom, if ever, has the situation so favored continued expansion.

Business is no longer wholly dependent upon the war demands, the bumper crops, the widespread increase in production, in the working force and in the power of the people to purchase having established the basis for an era of unexampled prosperity.

There is, moreover, the further and highly significant increase of abundant supplies of money for all legitimate purposes while the arrangements for supplementary foreign credits augur well for the maintenance of the phenomenal movements in over-sea commerce.

The figures of merchandise exports, pig-iron output, bank clearings, and railroad earnings bring to light achievements without precedent, and to the list of remarkable attainments have been added those of unfilled steel tonnage and commodity prices.

The lumber trade improvement, first visible at the South, has reached the Pacific Northwest, where prices have been advanced; winter wheat marketing is freer, thus improving collections, and sales of spring wheat are large, despite holding by farmers; demand for coal is better, activity in steam grades testifying to enlarged industrial operations; railway transportation is of record proportions, the margin of idle cars has about disappeared, and shortages loom up as the railways strain to move the freight offering overcrowded rails and through congested terminals.

As to what is being accomplished in the matter of good times and prosperity under Democratic rule I might read now extracts from an Associated Press article sent out over the country on November 27:

NEW YORK, November 27.

The Delaware, Lackawanna & Western Railroad, whose lines are choked as far back as Scranton with loaded freight cars it can not

move, to-day notified its agents to accept no more freight for export until further notice.

More than 6,000 cars from the West, loaded with grain, feed, flour, copper, and hundreds of other commodities, have virtually turned the terminals of the road into a storage warehouse for weeks. Some of the cars have been here for 80 days.

Nearly every road terminal entering here is glutted with loaded freight cars standing idle on sidings for hundreds of miles back along the line, and it was stated that other roads would follow the Lackawanna's lead shortly.

I now read from an article in the Washington Times of a recent issue:

A gain of \$445,241,906 was made during the 10 months in the total value of exports of breadstuffs, cottonseed oil, cattle, hogs, sheep, meat, and dairy products, cotton, and mineral oils. Up to November of the present year these exports totaled \$1,145,240,826, as against \$699,998,920 for the first 10 months of last year.

More than \$87,625,000 of the gain this year was made by cotton, the exports being valued at \$349,975,904, as against \$262,349,975 last year. A total of 3,796,856,462 pounds, or 7,276,280 bales, of cotton have been shipped abroad thus far this year.

Among the big export items were 420,451,068 pounds of bacon, valued at \$55,683,943; 714,496,902 gallons of illuminating oil, worth \$42,385,934; 250,962,514 bushels of wheat, worth \$12,448,746; and 218,168,774 pounds of fresh beef, worth \$38,073,197.

For October of this year the exports of foods, cotton, and oil showed a gain of \$26,906,869 over the corresponding month last year, the figures being \$110,615,275 for the tenth month of this year and \$83,709,406 for last year.

I read from the Washington Herald of November 14, 1915:

[Washington Herald, Nov. 14, 1915.]

BROAD EXPANSION OF BUSINESS ACTIVITY ALL OVER COUNTRY.

The outstanding feature of the business situation in October has been the fact that all trade has been unmistakably better. We expressed the opinion two months ago, says the November bulletin of the National City Bank of New York, that as the season for fall trade came on, the country would swing into a broad, general state of activity, and that expectation has been realized. Every part of the country now sends good reports, and the contrast they make with the conditions of a year ago is calculated to inspire the most profound sentiments of relief, satisfaction, and gratitude.

The woolgrowers have sold this year's clip at record prices, and the live-stock interests are exceptionally prosperous. Farm seekers from other States are pouring into the States of the Northwest, where a limited amount of comparatively cheap lands are still to be had.

The metal mining industry of the West, which was badly crippled a year ago, is now in full swing. There is enormous activity in the production of copper, lead, and zinc; it is now up to capacity of the mines and smelters, and in the case of zinc the smelter capacity is being materially increased. So far as agriculture, stock raising, and mining go the West is exceedingly prosperous.

The available supply of labor is so fully employed that the situation is on the verge of being critical. Food supplies promise to be abundant and moderate in price for the coming year, and the outlook for general comfort and prosperity in the United States is at present very promising.

Here is an Associated Press dispatch from Washington:

WASHINGTON, D. C., December 13.

Uncle Sam's coffers were swelled during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1915, by the collection of \$415,681,023 by the internal-revenue bureau, according to the annual report of Commissioner W. H. Osborn to Secretary of the Treasury McAdoo. The collection was the greatest in the history of the bureau.

If you will examine closely the reports issued from this office you will find that this increase in collections is due not only to the unexampled prosperity which prevails in this country under Democratic rule, but to the fact that this office is equipped now to collect these revenues, and is collecting them. There have been no scandals in the transaction of any of the business of the Treasury Department in collecting internal revenues or revenues on imports at our ports. There have been no stories of bribing of little fifteen-dollar and twenty-dollar a week Government checkers and weighers or manipulation of scales on Government wharves by which great institutions under a Republican administration were able to steal from the Treasury of the United States millions and millions of dollars. We have conducted these various departments of this Government honestly, and we are collecting the moneys that are coming to this Government from these various sources; and that is one reason for this increase in collections reported from this department of the Government charged with making them. These favorable reports as to trade expansion which will be permanent, according to these Republican authorities, all of them worthy of more consideration than these gentlemen who make partisan speeches on that side of the House, continue until the present time, and they will continue indefinitely in the future.

You declared in your platform that you are in favor of a tariff board or a tariff commission, I do not care what you call it, to apply tariff rates to changing conditions. In the history of this country and of the world were economic conditions ever changing more rapidly than they are now? Germany is our great competitor for the world's markets. As a member of the committee and one of the conferees which had in charge the

drafting of the Underwood tariff bill, I want to say, and even gentlemen on that side will agree with me, that the Underwood tariff bill was framed with reference to possible German competition in the future. Germany was our real competitor for the markets of the world, and Germany will continue to be when this war is over our real competitor for the world's markets. You are in favor of a tariff commission, you say, if it can be a Republican tariff commission. You are in favor of a tariff commission modeled upon the German plan, because there you say they are committed to the doctrine of protection. Do you know that they are about to abandon the doctrine of protection over there?

Is it possible the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Moore] has not been reading the inspired articles which find their way into our press, copied from journals faithfully representing the ideas of the government in Germany, in which the information is given out that at the end of the war they propose to take off their tariff on foodstuffs entirely? They propose to put foodstuffs on the free list, and they have gone so far as to declare that they propose to put the necessities of life on the free list. What they propose to do with the other things they have not yet announced, but we know, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Moore] knows, how they revise tariffs over there in Germany. Find fault with us for discontinuing the activities of the tariff board, and then say that we want the kind of a tariff board that is possible over there in Germany! Why, when they get through with a revision of the tariff in Germany they discharge their tariff board from further activities. They have a tariff board there composed of 30 men, 15 of them selected by representatives of certain industries and 15 of them selected by the representatives of the German Emperor and confirmed by their legislative body. After they revised their tariff in 1902—and that is the last German revision—they, in protection Germany, discharged their board. That is what we did here, and nothing else. We followed the kind of program you say you stand for and shut off the activities of this tariff board when we had put upon the books the greatest tariff law ever constructed in this country up until that time [applause on the Democratic side], a tariff law which had already compelled the great Arlington Mills over there in Massachusetts to announce that its next delivery of worsteds would be placed on the market at a reduction of 25 per cent, and all over the country announcements of reductions in wholesale prices were being made when this war broke out.

We have only done in our manipulation of the tariff question exactly what you say ought to be done, for we have followed the German practice. But the German tariff law enacted in 1902 was preliminary to her treaties, and her commercial treaties with all the commercial nations of the world expire this present year. As soon as this war is over, of course, the German tariff will be revised. It must be revised in order to meet the new treaties which they propose to make. According to your own provision contained in your own platform, has not the time come now when there are changing conditions, conditions which require the activities of a tariff board, conditions which require that a nonpartisan tariff board be appointed for the purpose of keeping pace with the approaching German tariff revision, for the purpose of keeping pace and being in a position to inform the Congress, with facts and data as to the changing conditions the world over, which everyone knows this war is going to bring about? We are going to give you an opportunity, all of you on that side, to stand on your own platform, or an opportunity to flop from your platform, as the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Moore] and his distinguished leader, the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Penrose], have already done. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

THE WAR AND THE TARIFF.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker—

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman from Massachusetts rise?

Mr. ROGERS. I desired to be recognized in my own right.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for one hour.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, the first half of the legislative history of the Wilson administration ended when the Sixty-third Congress, the 4th of March last, adjourned sine die. The second half began when the Sixty-fourth Congress convened last month.

We have passed the halfway mark. The moment seems opportune for a review of the record of the administration upon its legislative side. Such a review can, of course, not be even attempted in a single speech, and in my remarks to-day I shall confine myself, in the main, to an analysis of the fiscal policy and accomplishment of the last two years.

Three dates stand out as crucial in any such analysis, and I shall have occasion to refer to them again and again: The first, of course, is March 4, 1913, the birthday of the Democratic administration; the second is October 3, 1913, the date when the Underwood low-tariff law became effective; and the third, the day when the world war began, which may, for convenience, be assumed to be August 1, 1914.

With the enactment of the Underwood law there went on trial a tariff theory which had not been tested since the end of the second Cleveland administration, nearly 20 years earlier. Throughout the intervening period of Republican ascendancy the theory—whether or not faultily applied in its details is not at the moment the question—had been that a duty should be levied on all imports from other countries at least sufficient to make up for the lower wage scale which prevailed in those countries; in short, the underlying theory was that our tariff should afford protection to our American wage earners against goods made where lower wages and standards of living made cheaper production possible.

With the advent of the Democratic Party a new theory of tariff making succeeded—that the tariff should be as low as possible—that is, that free trade should be as closely approximated as possible—having always in mind the necessity of raising sufficient funds to carry on the Government. This theory, variously described as the "revenue only" and as the "competitive" theory, found full expression in the Underwood law of October, 1913.

It may not be amiss to say a preliminary and general word about the operation of this law prior to the breaking out of the European war.

For the first seven months of 1913 (January to July, inclusive)—all under the Republican tariff—the imports from other countries into the United States amounted to about \$1,016,000,000.

For the same seven months of 1914—all under the Democratic tariff and prior to the outbreak of the European war—the imports amounted to \$1,137,000,000.

In other words, under the low-tariff theory of the Democratic Party we brought into this country before the war was even thought of \$121,000,000 more foreign-made goods in seven months than we did in the same period of 1913 under the protective theory of the Republican tariff. In short, European and Asiatic labor (instead of American labor) was yearly getting the wages involved in the manufacture of over \$200,000,000 worth of goods in excess of its allotment under Republican rule.

But American labor can be employed upon articles for export as well as upon articles for domestic consumption. We have just seen that the Democratic tariff cut deeply into the latter source of American employment. How did it affect the former?

For the first seven months of 1913—January to July, inclusive, all under the Republican tariff—exports from the United States to other countries amounted to about \$1,323,000,000.

For the same seven months of 1914—all under a Democratic tariff and prior to the outbreak of the European war—our exports amounted to \$1,198,000,000.

In other words, under the Democratic régime, before war was even declared, we sent out to other lands \$125,000,000 fewer homemade goods in seven months than we did in the same period of the previous year under a Republican tariff—at the rate of over \$200,000,000 a year.

We have seen that imports increased \$121,000,000 in the seven months of the Underwood tariff and that exports decreased \$125,000,000 in the same period. The sale of American-made goods had consequently fallen off some \$246,000,000 in seven months, or at the rate of over \$400,000,000 a year and more than a million dollars a day. Wage earners in America suffered accordingly; wage earners in Europe and Asia profited accordingly.

For the first time in 20 years our balance of trade was persistently against us. In the five months—April to August, inclusive, 1914—our imports exceeded our exports by nearly \$40,000,000. Our exports had exceeded our imports during 1913 by about \$60,000,000 a month; exports exceeded imports for the first nine months of 1914 by barely \$9,000,000 a month.

It is no wonder that unemployment was rife during the first half of 1914; that bread lines and soup kitchens were once more established in our cities; that the Democratic Party trembled as it watched the workings of the tariff and its effect upon the industries of the country.

Then came the war. I shall examine in some detail the workings of the war upon our fiscal arrangements and our foreign trade. But first let me point out two or three things:

First. Obviously a world war would have some effect upon the foreign trade of the United States.

Second. The fairest time, therefore, to judge dispassionately the workings of a tariff law would be when the world was at peace, when foreign trade was normal.

Third. The natural effect of a great war would be to reduce somewhat the articles which the warring nations would send abroad for sale and to increase the articles which they would seek to purchase of neutrals.

Fourth. Clearly these manifestations are attributable to abnormal conditions, and have nothing to do with the merits or demerits of our tariff legislation.

Fifth. Naturally the party in power would seize upon the unsettled state of things to explain away any troubles of its own, however widely disconnected in fact with the war.

When the war had progressed a short time our imports diminished considerably below what they had been during the Democratic peace period, though not, as I shall show, below what they had been in Republican days. Our exports began similarly to increase, mainly by reason of "war orders." Times inevitably began to improve. But can this improvement be attributed to the Underwood tariff? The Democrats say, "Yes"; the Republicans and common sense say, "No, the European war is simply covering up in part the faults of your tariff theory by reducing imports while increasing exports, and thus establishing a sort of tariff of necessity." Curiously, however, the Democrats while claiming that conditions since the war began prove that their tariff is everything that it should be at the same time attribute their domestic financial straits to the war. In other words, they blow hot and blow cold.

Perhaps I may illustrate this last point by several recent utterances of eminent Democrats.

President Wilson said the other day:

The Underwood law can not be held responsible for any appreciable reduction in revenue as a result of the war.

Secretary McAdoo, of the Treasury Department, in his annual report refers to certain decreases in revenue and says:

Practically all of these decreases are the direct result of the European war.

On another occasion he said:

Because of the decrease of imports on account of the war we have had an enormous deficit. This deficit would have been vastly larger, however, if the old tariff bill had been relied upon. At least \$130,000,000 would have been added to the deficit had the country depended on the old bill.

Senator GORE said in Lowell last October:

McCall says our national finances are disarranged. This is a vague accusation, but we say that the disorganization is due to the war and not to the tariff law or any other Democratic measure.

Here is certainly a cordial, though perhaps not too discriminating, blanket indorsement. The gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] said recently of our financial condition:

This condition is due solely to the disturbed conditions resulting from the war.

Assistant Secretary of the Treasury Malburn says that the loss of customs revenue due to the war would have been much greater under a protective tariff than it has been under the Underwood law.

The newspapers have naturally sounded the same keynote. The Houston Post, for example, said the other day:

Our imports from Europe (since the war) have been negligible.

Many Republican papers have taken up the cry. I quote from an editorial in a Republican protectionist newspaper:

Part of the effects of the Underwood tariff may be judged by what had happened to our importations before the war intervened to afford to American industry a protection such as it never enjoyed in time of peace. For the present, the tariff is almost absolutely suspended as an element bearing on American manufacture. What would have happened to our cotton and woolen industry by this time if the war had not come along to interrupt almost completely the operation of foreign manufacturing and the importation of goods into the United States?

It is easy to deduce from the foregoing quotations that the Democratic leaders have sought to impress two things upon the minds of the people, and that they have been generally successful with superficial observers in their endeavor:

First. That our importations have practically been brought to a standstill since the European war began.

Second. That the admitted financial difficulties of the United States Government are attributable to the loss of customs revenues which results from the suspension of imports.

It therefore becomes of consequence to consider the truth or falsity of the two statements which have been persistently advanced by so many Democratic speakers and writers during the past year.

Perhaps, however, the issue can be most clearly drawn by a further quotation from Secretary McAdoo:

The European war seriously and adversely affected the revenues of the Government from imports. The revenue from customs for the month of October, 1914, was \$16,000,000, and for the month of October, 1913,

it was \$30,000,000, showing a decrease in one month of \$14,000,000. I have taken the month of October for the purpose of comparison, as the new tariff went into effect October, 1913, and duties were therefore the same. The reduction in revenues is due solely to the falling off in importations.

Here we have the issue squarely presented by the Secretary of the Treasury himself: "The reduction in revenues is due solely to the falling off in importations."

But if we turn to the figures issued by his colleague, the Secretary of Commerce, and showing the importations for the months in question, we find:

Imports.	
October, 1913.....	\$132,949,802
October, 1914.....	133,080,520
October, 1915.....	149,172,729

Thus it appears that the imports, instead of falling off, actually increased over \$5,000,000 in October, 1914, when half the world was at war, as compared with October, 1913, 10 months before the war had begun.

It seems incredible that the Secretary of the Treasury made the above statement with intent to deceive; yet it must be admitted that he was guilty either of such intent or of gross carelessness almost equally culpable. Manifestly as far as the month of October is concerned "the reduction in revenues" is not due solely or at all "to the falling off in importations."

But this, it may be said, was, after all, but one month. How about the war period as a whole? Does it show a great shrinkage in imports? An examination of the figures issued by the Secretary of Commerce shows that the importations have, in general, decreased somewhat during the Democratic war period (Aug., 1914, to date) as compared with the Democratic peace period (Oct., 1913, to Aug., 1914). But, as I have said, the imports during the Democratic peace period were swollen out of all proportion and broke all records in our history. A fairer comparison is with imports under the Republican tariff just before its repeal, during the spring and summer months of 1913.

The imports May, 1913, to August, 1913, averaged \$135,000,000 per month.

The imports March, 1915, to December, 1915, averaged well over \$150,000,000 per month.

In other words, our imports during the war have recently been averaging \$15,000,000 a month more than our imports two years earlier and just prior to the enactment of the Underwood law. For the entire war period, including the months when foreign trade was at its lowest ebb, the average imports are over \$140,000,000 a month, or \$5,000,000 a month more than in Republican days. But, as I say, with things continuing as they now are, the increase in imports is \$15,000,000 a month, or \$180,000,000 a year over Republican imports.

Our recent imports, as shown by the bulletins of the Department of Commerce, have been:

Fiscal year ended—	
1911.....	\$1,527,226,105
1912.....	1,653,264,934
1913.....	1,813,008,234
1914.....	1,893,925,657
1915.....	1,674,169,740

Our recent imports entered for consumption have been:

Fiscal year ended—	
1911.....	\$1,527,945,652
1912.....	1,640,722,902
1913.....	1,766,689,412
1914.....	1,906,400,394
1915.....	1,648,380,280

The imports for the year 1912 were larger by \$100,000,000 than those of any previous year in our history. It will be seen that the imports for 1915, including 11 war months, were \$21,000,000 larger than the record 1912 year and were exceeded only by the Democratic years 1913 and 1914. The 1915 imports exceeded those for 1911 by nearly \$150,000,000.

Does all this sound like a "dormant" or a "suspended" tariff? Are the imports really "negligible"? In point of fact, the imports are to-day ahead of the Republican high-water mark, although doubtless somewhat below what the Democratic tariff would permit to be dumped upon us if there were no war. [Applause.]

It is undoubtedly true, I repeat, that the war has somewhat served to neutralize the worst effects of the Underwood tariff. To that extent it operates indirectly as a protective tariff. But it is by no means a tariff wall. In June, 1915, for example, our imports were \$157,695,140—larger than those of any June in our history, Republican or Democratic, war or peace. This figure is \$26,000,000 more than the June, 1913, figure and is 57 per cent in excess of the mark established in the boom year 1906. As we have seen, October, 1915, imports were larger than for either October, 1913 or 1914. November, 1915, imports were \$164,319,169, the largest of the 16 war months, and exceeded by but 2 of the 10 Democratic peace months. They are the

largest November imports in our history. December's imports were seven and one-half millions larger even than November's—\$171,841,665. These are with one exception, 1913, the largest December imports in history.

We have heard much concerning the financial struggles of the United States during the past two years. The Secretary of the Treasury attributes our difficulties "solely to the falling off in importations." We have seen that in fact there has been no falling off in importations as compared with Republican times; quite the contrary. Yet it is undoubtedly true that customs revenues have materially fallen off.

For the period January, 1913, to October, 1913, our customs receipts, under the Republican tariff, averaged \$27,000,000 per month.

For the period January, 1915, to November, 1915—the Democratic war period—our customs receipts, in spite of the fact that our imports were on the average a little larger, averaged \$16,000,000 per month. Thus with about the same imports we are losing about \$11,000,000 a month customs revenues, or \$132,000,000 a year.

There is the real explanation of our empty Treasury. The reduction in duties has reduced the revenues; the reduction in importations is a myth in spite of the stress laid upon it by Democratic apologists.

The whole story is told by an examination of the average rates of duty paid upon imports year by year. In the second Cleveland administration this average ad valorem rate was about 20 per cent. During the dozen years of the Dingley tariff it ranged from 22 per cent to 29 per cent. During the Payne tariff it ranged from 17 per cent to 21 per cent. For the fiscal year ended June 30, 1915, the first full fiscal year of the Underwood law, it was 12.49 per cent—by far the lowest for a century. Since June it has been sinking even lower and now does not exceed 10 per cent—certainly a close approximation to free trade. For the week ending Christmas Day the rate was 8.7 per cent. This means, of course, that the imports remaining the same, for every dollar which goes into our Treasury at this rate of duty \$2 or \$2.50 would have gone in if Republican rates had been maintained. Another interesting sidelight upon the present-day workings of the Democratic tariff is that over 70 per cent of all goods recently entering the country have come in without paying a cent's worth of duty. The other 30 per cent is bearing the burden, imperfectly, of course, but nevertheless as best it can. Under Republican tariffs from 40 per cent to 50 per cent only came in altogether free of duty, and the burden was distributed over at least one-half of all imports, instead of as to-day over less than one-third.

The customs revenues for the last fiscal year were \$209,786,672; realized, as above stated, from duties averaging about 12½ per cent upon \$1,674,169,740 worth of imports. If a rate of only 20 per cent had been assessed upon these imports, the resulting duties would have been \$335,000,000, or about \$125,000,000 in excess of what they were in fact. This solution would have put into the Treasury nearly \$50,000,000 more than has the iniquitous war tax, with all its annoyances and vexations. In substantiation of this statement it is worth remembering that a Republican protective tariff made possible the building of the Panama Canal without imposing any considerable burden upon the people, but, instead, mainly out of the "loose change" which the Treasury had in its pockets. If we had retained Republican duties and observed reasonable economy, we could have embarked upon the proposed program of national defense without further taxation of any kind.

I have heard the statement made by certain Democrats that, admitting that imports began to flood the country when the Underwood law was enacted, nevertheless that these imports were mainly of raw materials or of goods only partly manufactured, so that their arrival meant more work for United States wage earners. Nothing could be further from the fact, as an examination of the figures of the Department of Commerce will show. Take, for example, the imports of manufactures of cotton and wool, in which the district which I represent is vitally interested:

Cotton cloths.

	10 months ending July—		
	1913 (Republican peace period).	1914 (Democratic peace period).	1915 (Democratic war period).
Square yards.....	36,735,303	56,713,780	36,978,608
Value.....	\$6,712,274	\$10,896,575	\$5,671,198

This little table shows two interesting things:

First. The first effect of the Underwood law was to increase the imports of cotton cloth by 54 per cent, or, in other words, to substitute in 10 months, for 20,000,000 yards of American-made goods 20,000,000 yards of foreign-made goods. Four million dollars more went across the ocean to pay for these goods; all this would have remained in the United States under a Republican tariff.

Second. Though importations are said to be "dormant" because of the war, we imported more yards of cotton cloth in 10 war months than we did in the corresponding months under a Republican tariff.

The situation with reference to imports of manufactures of wool is briefly as follows:

Wool manufactures.

Seven months ending July—

1913 (Republican peace period).....	\$8, 870, 101
1914 (Democratic peace period).....	29, 239, 274
1915 (Democratic war period).....	11, 240, 251

It will be here noted that—

First. For every dollar of wool manufactures that was imported under the Republican tariff, \$3.30 was imported after the enactment of the Underwood law and before the war broke out.

Second. Even since the "tariff wall," alleged by certain leading Democrats to have resulted from the war, our imports of wool manufactures are about one-third larger than under the Republican tariff.

United States Consul Ingram at Bradford, England, reported a large increase of January, 1914, textile reports. The Bradford correspondent of the Daily Trade Record said:

If anyone had forecasted that in December of 1913 more dress goods would be sent from Bradford to the United States than in the 11 months previous, very few people would have believed him. But the lower duties have had a wonderful influence on the West Riding trade. Dress goods to the value of £131,570 (\$639,430) have been exported, compared with £131,071 (\$637,005) for the first 11 months of 1913.

A startling increase in worsted coatings on last January of over 500 per cent has to be recorded. This shows that Yorkshire is going to clothe part of the American nation.

It apparently can not be said with truth that the war—much less the Underwood tariff—operates to bar out completed manufactures of the kind which competes most directly with our own workmen.

If I were to attempt to summarize briefly the effect of the Underwood tariff, in peace and war, upon imports and revenues, I should say this:

First. During the months just before the war, but under the Underwood law, our imports were about \$25,000,000 a month more than for the previous year under Republican rule, while our customs revenues were about \$5,000,000 a month less. American workmen were making fewer goods at the rate of \$300,000,000 a year, and our customs were nevertheless decreasing at the rate of \$60,000,000 a year. It is not difficult to account for the unemployment and industrial disaster which were rampant, or to guess what would have happened in 1915 had not war intervened.

Second. Since the war, imports have been, in general, a little more than in the last months of the Republican tariff. Revenues, owing to the low ad valorem rates, have decreased enormously.

Prosperity in the United States can, generally speaking, be promoted by keeping down to a reasonable figure the imports, or by increasing the exports, or both. The United States happily is to-day enjoying a considerable measure of prosperity, conspicuously in contrast with the situation in the spring and summer of 1914. Why? Manifestly for two reasons:

First. Because the war has checked the unconscionably large imports which were flooding the country during the six or eight months just preceding its outbreak, reducing them about to the Republican level.

Second. Because, as everybody knows, "war orders" have increased our exports almost beyond belief.

With apparent lack of candor, Secretary Redfield seems to attempt to make the American people believe that our export trade is normal, healthy, permanent business, attributable to the genius of the Democratic administration. He says:

You who are told that the increase of exports which has turned the balance of trade in our favor is due to munitions of war are mistaken, if you believe that.

We have seen that under the peace period of the Underwood tariff, our imports, for months at a time, were exceeding our exports; that is, the balance of trade was against us.

To-day our exports are enormously exceeding our imports by from \$150,000,000 to \$200,000,000 per month. That is, the balance of trade is heavily in our favor.

Does anyone doubt that this unprecedented overturn is ascribable to anything but war orders? Of course not. Secretary Redfield knows it, but apparently seeks to pull the wool

over our eyes by limiting his statement to "munitions of war." We are, in part, feeding, clothing, and arming the armies of Europe, and whether you call our exports for this purpose "munitions of war" or "war orders," it in no way alters the nature of our trade.

The following table shows a few of the conspicuous increases in exports. Can anyone doubt their cause?

Articles exported.

	9 months ending September—		
	1913 (Republican peace period).	1914 (Democratic peace period). ¹	1915 (Democratic war period).
Animals, live.....	\$5, 600, 000	\$4, 600, 000	\$96, 200, 000
Breadstuffs.....	166, 800, 000	172, 800, 000	423, 400, 000
Explosives.....	3, 800, 000	4, 800, 000	84, 300, 000
Meats.....	120, 200, 000	97, 700, 000	191, 800, 000
Cotton, raw and manufactured.....	323, 800, 000	276, 300, 000	378, 400, 000
Wool manufactures.....	3, 400, 000	3, 500, 000	25, 200, 000

¹ 2 months war.

Brass and its manufactures, automobiles, chemicals and drugs, rubber goods, iron and steel manufactures, boots, shoes, leather, sugar, and zinc are the other articles which show tremendous increases. The explanation of each is, of course, patent.

The following quotation from a Lowell paper of December 24 last shows more clearly than any words of mine could show the nature and extent of our prosperity of to-day and the reasons for it: Eighteen months ago this concern was employing 600 people; in a few months it will be employing over 8,000:

The largest amount of money ever paid out by a mercantile corporation in this city was distributed yesterday by the United States Cartridge Co. when its employees received not only their regular weekly wages but, in addition, the money in back pay due them as a result of the finding of the State board of arbitration in the recent hearing granted as an outcome of the strike.

The amount disbursed yesterday totaled \$100,000 and was distributed among 6,400 employees. Of this sum \$30,000 was the money due on back wages, in accordance with the increase fixed by the State board, to commence September 28. The balance represented the regular weekly pay roll of the company.

Perhaps I can do no better than to quote the recent words of a distinguished Democrat of Massachusetts, Mr. E. F. McSweeney, chairman of the directors of the port of Boston:

The belief that our foreign trade has improved since the war is unjustified. The great increase in the value of our exports is due wholly to the demand for supplies and materials used in warfare and has upset the industrial balance of the United States. At the present time we are sending out of this country to the warring nations of Europe munitions and accessories of war at the rate of \$100,000,000 per month in excess of the normal export before the war. This means that we have about 800,000 wage earners employed for a full year who at the close of the war will be the innocent victims of the gigantic readjustment that must take place in industrial America.

Our prosperity to-day carries great dangers with it. There is no doubt that after the war there will be an extreme reaction, and the longer the war lasts the harsher and more severe this will be.

Our trade balance for the year ending June 30, 1915, in normal legitimate merchandise was smaller than it has been since 1910 and almost \$200,000,000 less than that of the year before the war.

In September last, in sending me a speech delivered by Mr. McSweeney, one of his associates wrote me as follows:

The artificial stimulation to trade due to the export of war orders has given our wage earners an opportunity for employment, but this flurry has operated to obscure the vitally important question of the permanent extension of our export trade on a normal basis. If the war should cease to-morrow, it is likely that the business of this country would be thrown into great disorganization, and wage earners especially would suffer.

Of the present trade balance of \$1,000,000,000 in favor of the United States, over \$700,000,000 are exports solely for war purposes—ammunition, horses, auto trucks, army shoes, foodstuffs, etc.—trade which will cease the instant the war comes to a close. This leaves a balance of only \$300,000,000 of exports of what might be termed "regular merchandise," an export smaller than that of any year since 1909, and almost \$200,000,000 less than in the year before the war.

Comparing the present year of exports from the United States with that of the year before the war, we find we have exported only 32 per cent as much agricultural implements, 52 per cent as much sewing machines, and 33 per cent as much steel rails. The most lamentable fact in connection with these figures is that we are losing as much, if not more, to the countries which are not at war as to those which have given up domestic pursuits to take up armed conflict.

Last year's figures show that of our sewing-machine export trade the total in 1915 was only 54 per cent of the 1914 figures; that to South America but 20 per cent, and that to Africa, Asia, and the Pacific islands but 35 per cent of the corresponding previous year.

Our exports of the staple merchandise which we hope to sell under normal conditions after the war are smaller by a large percentage in practically everything except war orders, and we are losing our exports trade much faster to the neutral countries than to the belligerent ones.

Doubtless we all are thankful that we are spared participation in the horrors of war; doubtless we recognize that we are within our rights in selling all we can to the belligerents, and that in so doing we are accorded a prosperity which would otherwise be denied us. And yet I doubt if any of us are very proud of this

blood-soaked prosperity. The growth which has come to us is of a dropsical character; it is not a normal, healthy, permanent increase in bone and sinew. It will leave us almost in an instant when the war ends.

More than this, as even Secretary Redfield recognizes, when the war ends we shall be subjected to the bitterest competition in history from the countries of Europe which are now at war, but which, after peace is declared, will at once go to work, and yet will be too poor to buy. They will "dump" their products upon us in unbelievable quantity.

How are we to protect ourselves against this industrial invasion? In only one way—by a protective tariff. In this connection an editorial from one of the leading Democratic newspapers of the country (Boston Globe, Nov. 9, 1915) is of interest:

WE MUST PREPARE FOR INDUSTRIAL INVASION AFTER EUROPEAN WAR.

American business conditions will be more disturbed after the great war than during the conflict. At present the belligerent nations are absorbed in crushing each other. Now they are seeking to buy all that we can sell, from shrapnel to shoestrings. With the coming of peace those nations will try to recuperate from their enormous losses by grabbing all the world trade they have lost. An industrial war, in which we will have the most to lose, and into which we shall be drawn, will follow the present crisis. Obviously we must prepare to meet the coming struggle in the best way to safeguard American industry.

The commercial prosperity of this country will be attacked from both flanks. We shall lose our munitions market. This will mean much readjustment of capital and labor. Factories now working overtime to supply war materials must be converted to other lines of trade. How seriously this transition will affect American industry will, of course, depend upon our skill and forethought.

The other attack will come from the belligerent nations themselves in their effort to recover lost trade. To-day their industries are being pauperized by child and female labor. Women have gone into industry to take the place of men who have gone to the front. Since many of the men who have gone to the front will never come back, many of the women who have gone into industry will never go back to home life.

The men who do come back will be forced to seek almost any kind of work they can find to cover the difference between their pensions and a living wage. All this means pauperized industry. Low wages will enable those nations to produce cheap goods. This sudden rejuvenation of production will create commercial rivalry between the new European producers and the American manufacturers, particularly the Americans who have gone into making goods that Europe produced before the war.

The European nations will seek ruthlessly to crush their American rivals, since we shall be their principal opponents in their efforts to recover from the losses by war. Their method will be the most effective one possible. This method is "dumping."

Dumping is an economic expression used to define the industrial process of ruining a rival by selling goods in the rival's territory at prices so low that the rival can not meet them.

Goods produced cheaply will be poured into the United States after the war to undersell American-made goods produced in normal conditions. Our budding dye industry, for example, will be swamped under a flood of German chemicals, sold at prices below the cost of production here.

The sudden renewal of peaceful industry in Europe will soon create a surplus of goods. Then will come the most dangerous form of dumping. Since it is obvious that the European manufacturers will be anxious to maintain prices at home, where they have less competition, they will dump their surplus goods into America at prices even below the cost of production in Europe. This will be killing two birds with one stone. It will be getting rid of an embarrassing surplus which, if kept in Europe, would reduce prices there; it will also be a crushing blow to American rivalry, which had grown during the war.

It is evident that we must be prepared to meet this competition. If we do nothing to stop this flood of European pauper goods our country will suffer one of its worst financial panics. Many businesses will be ruined. Thousands of men will be thrown out of work; the labor market will be drugged with hungry men; the soup kitchen; the bread line; scared capital; industrial chaos.

It is time now, therefore, for us to prepare for the coming industrial war. It is a menace far more vital than actual war, over which we are so much concerned. For us it is a question of national defense arising out of a colossal international war, and it must be met with broad-minded statescraft and not by any party politics.

Obviously we must put up our defenses and place them in the hands of skilled business strategists. It is not a question that can be solved in congressional hearing rooms.

Secretary of Commerce Redfield has a tentative plan to curb European industries by an amendment to the antitrust laws, forbidding foreign corporations from doing business in this country unless they conform to our Sherman law. This means endless litigation, with no hope of a solution until long after the crisis has passed, most of the damage done, American business invaded from coast to coast.

The Sherman law causes enough tribulation in American business circles now without our seeking to apply it to the rest of the world. It will cause more confusion when, of all times, we shall want less. It would be just the method by which to aid the jealous European countries to ruin our new prosperity.

The question is too vital for confusing litigation. It is a question of national defense. Our Army could not repel an invasion by appealing to the Sherman antitrust law. We must not expect our industrial army to suffer this invasion.

Our industrial defense is our tariff. We must keep out pauper goods from war-sodden Europe. The problem is economic and complicated. We must have an industrial board of strategy to watch the situation, learn all its ramifications, and close all gaps in our defenses. This board must be an expert tariff commission.

"Our industrial defense is our tariff." That tells the whole story. The war saved the Democratic Party for the moment; when peace comes nothing can save it from utter dissolution but the adoption of the protective-tariff principle. Some of its statesmen seem to recognize that this is true.

For example, Senator LEWIS, of Illinois, is quoted in the Louisville Courier-Journal of October 31, 1915, as having spoken in part as follows at a rally in Mount Sterling, Ky.:

No intelligent man would urge that the adoption of either of the past tariff systems—that of the unqualified high prohibition of any imports to this country, known as protective tariff of the Republicans, or that of no tariff beyond that for the purpose of raising revenue, of the Democrats—could be appropriately applied as conserving the uses of the future and as fitting to the future welfare of America.

To allow the manufactured article of Europe to come without limit to this country as a Democratic theory, the goods to be sold at such price as Europe could take in order to obtain money to build up her wasted places, would be to overcome our own manufactures and slay the possibility of establishing in America plants to take the place of those which heretofore in Europe served the uses of America and the world.

Still more recently, in a signed editorial published in the New York American of December 26, 1915, William Randolph Hearst "earnestly urged the Democratic Party to abandon its free-trade policy, a policy which had persistently proved a disastrous failure, which had continually plunged the country into the depths of financial depression during Democratic administrations, and which had invariably resulted in a deficiency of revenue, which had to be met by extraordinary taxation or bond issues."

Mr. Hearst says:

Our so-called war taxes, the burden of which was lately reimposed upon the country by Congress, are, as a matter of fact, not war taxes at all. They are free-trade taxes.

ASSESSED TO MEET DEFICIT.

They are the tax additions which invariably follow Democratic tariff reductions.

They are direct assessments, levied upon the public to meet the deficit caused by the customary and conventional Democratic experiments in free trade.

However destructive the ultimate effect of the European war may be upon the foreign markets of this country, the immediate effect of the war has undoubtedly been to increase the consumption and accentuate the demand in Europe for a considerable number of our American products.

GREAT EUROPEAN DEMAND.

All sorts of food supplies and all sorts of manufactured articles required by the gigantic European armies have been in unusual demand and at extraordinary prices.

America therefore has sold an unusual amount of certain products at exceptionally high rates, with great commercial and financial advantage.

On the other hand, the scarcity of productive European labor, the demands of Europe for its own materials, the difficulties and dangers of transportation by sea, have to a considerable extent excluded European products from the United States.

COUNTRY SAVED FROM DISASTER.

The European war, therefore, and the conditions which it has created, should have brought unprecedented, even though impermanent, prosperity to the United States, and if the war has failed to do this, because of the Democratic depression which it has had first to overcome, it has, at any rate, saved the country from the full disaster of the Democratic policy of reckless tariff reduction.

We have as yet, therefore, fortunately felt but little of free-trade disaster, and only such free-trade depression as must follow conditions of business disturbance, combined with the daze of uncertainty and the dread of impending injury.

Soon, however, the European war must end. Then the full effect of the Democratic policy of unscientific tariff reduction will fall upon our country.

ARTIFICIAL DEMAND TO END.

We will then no longer have the enormous artificial demand for war supplies and food products which has partly sustained our industries, or, rather, which has sustained part of our industries during this war period.

We must then confront the unhappy condition of having our markets much more than ever open to European competition, and our own products much less than ever in demand in European markets.

The present administration is no doubt well meaning enough, but it is impractical and inexperienced.

It is an administration of theories and vagaries, of prejudices and impulses, of incongruities and inconsistencies.

It is an administration of visionary policy conceived in vanity and confirmed in fanatical obstinacy. Our national yield of golden fleece from wealth-producing industries will be diminished to a proportionate degree. Our national resources in products and profits, in work and wages, will be decreased to a similar extent.

Not only individuals, but the Nation has felt a lack of income despite the artificial stimulus of war prices.

Thus taxes have been increased, although our ability to pay them is not as great as it once was.

And the end is not yet.

We have still to face the full and final results of Democratic folly and fatuity, which will surely be upon us at the end of the European war.

Why, then, should the Democratic Party, now reassembled in Congress, not take advantage of the temporary respite which the war provides?

Why should the Democrats in Congress, and in the administration, too, if there be any there, not realize and admit that a tariff for revenue and for protection is not merely a Republican policy—it is an American policy?

It has been approved by the American people, it has been indorsed by history, fortified by fact and sustained by experience.

Two or three sentences of Mr. Hearst's editorial are worthy of especial emphasis:

Our so-called war taxes, the burden of which was lately reimposed upon the country by Congress, are, as a matter of fact, not war taxes at all. They are free-trade taxes.

They are the tax additions which invariably follow Democratic tariff reductions.

Soon, however, the European war must end. Then the full effect of the Democratic policy of unscientific tariff reduction will fall upon our country.

We have still to face the full and final results of Democratic folly and fatuity, which will surely be upon us at the end of the European war.

Why should the Democrats in Congress not realize and admit that a tariff for revenue and for protection is not merely a Republican policy—it is an American policy?

The country can not afford to have the Underwood tariff operative for a single month after peace is declared. It was a failure and a scourge before the war; it is a failure and a menace to-day.

How did it fulfill the high hopes of its sponsors?

President Wilson said in his first address to Congress, April 8, 1913:

The object of the tariff duties henceforth laid must be effective competition, the whetting of American wits by contest with the wits of the rest of the world.

When the Underwood bill was signed by him October 2, 1913, he said:

I feel a very peculiar pleasure in what I have just done. I have had the accomplishment of something like this at heart ever since I was a boy.

Within a few weeks he is reported to have said to the Democratic national committeemen that the tariff was the only issue that the Republican Party had.

While I do not admit the truth of this statement, I think few Republicans would hesitate to take up the gauntlet thus thrown down by the President. But the point I wish to emphasize is that the Underwood law, with all its direful results, was no careless blunder; it represents the considered, final judgment of the leaders of the Democratic Party.

Senator SIMMONS, who had charge of the bill in the Senate, said (1) that it would prove adequate as a revenue producer with an estimated surplus of revenue at the close of the fiscal year 1914 of \$16,000,000 and at the close of the fiscal year 1915 of \$18,000,000, and (2) that it "will cut down the cost of living."

Mr. UNDERWOOD, in charge of the bill in the House, expressed himself similarly:

This law will do four things:

First. It will reduce the cost of living in the United States.

Second. It will not disturb the business of the country.

Third. It will increase our foreign trade.

Fourth. It will collect revenue sufficient to run the Government.

Let us take up these points in order.

First. Has the Underwood law reduced the cost of living?

Both Mr. UNDERWOOD and Speaker CLARK emphatically predicted it would. Every household can answer this question for himself.

The Democratic Party realized the importance of the problem. Its 1912 platform says:

The high cost of living is a serious problem in every American home; and we assert that no substantial relief can be secured for the people until import duties on the necessities of life are materially reduced.

Over 70 per cent of our imports now enter duty free. The average rate of duty is only 10 per cent. Nevertheless, where is the cost of living to-day? Common sense gives a complete answer, and scientifically assembled figures are at hand to corroborate common sense. In the New York Times Annalist appears weekly a "cost-of-living" index number.

An index number is a means of showing fluctuations in the average price of a group of commodities. The Annalist index number shows the fluctuations in the average wholesale price of 25 food commodities selected and arranged to represent a theoretical family's food budget.

For 1910 the index number was 137.

For 1911 the index number was 130.8.

For 1912 the index number was 142.9.

For 1913 the index number was 139.98.

For 1914 the index number was 146.07.

For 1915 the index number was 148.05.

In other words, the household supplies which are in daily use upon the table of the average family and which cost in 1911, a Republican year, \$1.31, cost last year, a Democratic year, \$1.48. Was this increase due to the war? In 1914, a Democratic year, during more than one-half of which peace reigned, the figure was but 2 cents less—\$1.46. These figures for 1914 and 1915, as compared with the Republican year 1911, represent percentages of increase, respectively, of 11.5 per cent and 13 per cent.

Mr. SMITH of New York. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS. I will.

Mr. SMITH of New York. In view of the artificial increase in trade, the gentleman would hardly argue that the Underwood tariff law has had a fair chance of operation or that these prices are due in any way to the Underwood law?

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I should answer that question in this way: I was rather inclined to think some one would ask the question. The war broke out August 1, 1914. For seven months of 1914 the world was at peace. Probably for at least a month or two thereafter, namely, for the months of August and September, no one would claim that there was any great fluctuation attributable to the war in the prices of the foodstuffs in this country. Certainly for seven-twelfths of the year 1914 there was no war at all, and therefore no possible effect from it upon the prices of our foodstuffs. Yet, as I say, for 1914, taking the year as a whole, the index number was 146, as compared with 148, the index number for 1915. I think myself that the European war has not had very much effect upon the cost of living in this country. It may be that some gentlemen can not agree with me, but I have made some study into that question, and that is my careful conclusion.

Second. Did the Underwood law disturb the business of the country? This, again, is a matter of common knowledge and common sense. I will, however, quote an expert's summary of business conditions in 1914, before war burst over Europe:

Let me summarize some of the features which marked our industrial condition during the first year of the Underwood-Simmons law, features which President Wilson called "a state of mind." Among them are 18,280 failures during the year 1914, the worst record in history in number, and exceeded in amount of liabilities only by another fateful Democratic year, 1893. Bank clearings, a fair measure of the country's business, were nearly \$20,000,000,000, or 11.1 per cent less than they were in 1912, the last year of Republican administration. Capital invested in new enterprises was less by over \$600,000,000 in 1914 than in 1913 and over \$700,000,000 less than in 1912. Railroad gross earnings declined 4.4 per cent; iron production, 25.3 per cent; and copper deliveries, 15 per cent. Steel mills were reduced 40 per cent of capacity; 30 per cent of the looms of our woolen mills were idle on December 1; and capital amounting to \$41,000,000 invested in cotton mills was unproductive. The importations of boots and shoes, though still not alarmingly large in amount, have more than doubled. The importation of cotton cloths has increased 80 per cent. England's exports of woolsens to the United States show the phenomenal increase to 8,219,000 yards in 1914, as compared with 2,190,000 in 1913, while in the case of worsteds England's shipments to the United States were 32,790,000 yards, against only 9,218,000 in the preceding year.

The most careful surveys showed that where there was one man unemployed in 1913-14 there were two unemployed during the winter of 1914-15. Without exaggeration, it was conceded by those familiar with conditions that one out of every five bread winners was unemployed. This unemployment was concentrated in cities primarily, but the small towns and villages also felt the shock and found it necessary to organize relief measures.

An official canvass in Philadelphia showed 200,000 men unemployed; the house-to-house canvass of the Metropolitan Insurance Co. of its policyholders in New York, thrifty people ordinarily, gave the basis for an estimate of 357,000 men and women out of work in the entire city. The labor organizations in New York City estimated that 472,102 were either out of work or on part time. In Chicago in January the municipal markets commission estimated 189,866 out of work. A Cleveland survey in December showed 61,000 unemployed. The city charities in Philadelphia estimated that Philadelphia's unemployed numbered 175,000.

Third. Has the Underwood law increased our foreign trade, as its author predicted it would?

Prior to the war the total volume of foreign trade—imports and exports combined—was nearly as large as for the corresponding months under a Republican tariff. But, as we have seen, imports—made by European workmen—were vastly larger, and exports—made by American workmen—were smaller in about the same amount. The American workman was, therefore, getting the short end in each respect. The "total-volume" basis of comparison is grossly misleading and utterly worthless under these circumstances. Since the war our exports have increased greatly, as we have seen, and our total volume of trade with them. But, as Mr. McSweeney points out, this is in no way attributable to the Underwood law.

Fourth. Has the Underwood law collected sufficient revenue to run the Government, as its author promised?

I have already dealt somewhat with this topic, but a complete answer involves study into the history of our Treasury during the past two or three years.

At the outset, it may be stated that the majority members of the Committee on Ways and Means, in their recent report recommending the extension of the "war tax," themselves admit the present dire straits of the Treasury. President Wilson, in his address to Congress of August 4, 1914, when first recommending the war tax, and again in his annual address delivered to the Congress last month, recognizes the gravity of the situation.

Commenting on these statements, the minority members of the Ways and Means Committee point out:

We, the minority members of the Ways and Means Committee, agree with the majority that the Treasury of the United States is in a distressing condition, and that additional revenues must be raised to meet the current expenses of the Government. We deny the statement of the majority that the necessity for an emergency revenue law is due mainly to conditions resulting from the war in Europe, and we assert that the deficit is due mainly to reduced rates of duty on imports provided for in the Underwood Tariff Act.

On September 4, 1914, when the President of the United States delivered his message to Congress urging the immediate enactment of

additional revenue legislation, he compared customs receipts for the month of August, 1913, when the Payne Tariff Act was in effect, with the month of August, 1914, when the Underwood Tariff Act was in effect, and showed a loss in customs receipts of some \$10,000,000. However, during the eight months preceding the war in Europe customs receipts averaged but \$22,200,000 per month, while the month of August, 1913, produced \$30,934,952. The loss in customs receipts was, therefore, very evident prior to the war in Europe.

Contrary to the impression conveyed by the majority report, imports at this time are not below normal. Imports for the eight months ended November 1, 1915, amount to \$1,203,452,698, an increase of \$56,000,000 over the corresponding eight months of 1913, when adequate customs receipts were being collected by the Government. In the table presented by the majority imports for the recent months are ignored completely. During this eight-month period, showing an increase of imports of \$56,000,000, the customs revenue receipts have declined to the extent of \$77,000,000. The average ad valorem rate of duty collected on imports during the 1913 period was 18.4 per cent, and during the 1915 period it was 11.1 per cent. This is due to the change in revenue laws and not the war in Europe. It is interesting and instructive to compare importations and customs receipts for the month of August, 1913 (the month on which the President based his calculations showing the necessity of additional revenue), with the month of August, 1915.

Imports, August, 1913.....	\$137,651,553
Imports, August, 1915.....	141,804,202
Gain in imports.....	4,152,649
Customs receipts, August, 1913.....	30,934,952
Customs receipts, August, 1915.....	15,780,540
Loss in revenue.....	15,154,412

Much of what is here quoted I have already discussed at length, but the statement is so clear and pertinent that I think it is worth including by way of summary.

But what are the facts as to the state of the Treasury? In the financial analysis issued daily by the Secretary of the Treasury appears an item, "Net balance in the general fund." This shows the cash on hand which Uncle Sam can use to pay his bills for supplies, employees, and so forth. It corresponds roughly with the checking account of an individual or a corporation:

July 1, 1914, the first day of the fiscal year, 1915, the net balance was.....	\$145,835,502
June 1, 1915, it was.....	14,000,000
(A loss of over \$130,000,000 in 11 months, or about \$12,000,000 a month.)	
June 30, 1915, owing to income-tax collections, it had risen to.....	\$2,025,716
September 30, 1915, it had shrunk to.....	40,898,894
(A loss of about \$14,000,000 per month, although, as we have seen, our imports were in excess of 1913 imports.)	

The press was full of warning articles, calling attention to the gravity of the financial danger. These warnings apparently got "under the skin" of Secretary McAdoo and "something happened" in the Treasury that memorable night of September 30, 1915. The time-honored method of showing our financial status was abandoned, and the statement of October 1, 1915, to the unbounded surprise of all of us who were watching with alarm our rapidly shrinking surplus, showed a balance of \$128,063,000. In other words, if the figures were to be believed, we had "made" \$87,000,000 overnight. Were we really richer by that or by any other amount? Not at all. The change was in bookkeeping; it was psychological, that is all. There was not an additional dollar in the Treasury.

How was this change wrought? By two alterations in the old method:

First, Funds turned over by the Treasury to the various disbursing officers of the Government and made available for payment by them of specific Government debts have always, and rightly, been treated as actual payments. They are no longer of any use to the Government, any more than the amount is to us which is represented by a check which we have drawn and sent to the payee. Secretary McAdoo in his statement of October 1 calmly treats these amounts as still assets of the Treasury. He thus captures a neat little item of over \$61,000,000 and adds it to his "balance."

Second, Money paid in by national banks to retire their bank notes has always been treated as a liability. It is deposited for one specific purpose, and can not be applied to any other; yet Secretary McAdoo removes this fund, amounting to over \$23,000,000, from the liability side of this account and adds that also to his "balance."

I do not charge that Secretary McAdoo was dishonest in apparently adding \$87,000,000 to the Treasury by a stroke of the pen. The true figures can still be deduced by careful scrutiny from the statements in their present form. But I do charge that the changes were made, not for financial reasons but for political reasons. On December 17 last the able chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, Mr. GLASS, made an elaborate defense of Secretary McAdoo's course. Yet he admitted that as to the second change above referred to—

I venture to think that trust funds should not be counted as available Treasury funds—

And as to the first change, that—

Should anybody ask a layman's opinion as to the proper place of this account on the ledger, I would be disposed to say that it should be segregated in the accounting as well as in fact.

And the expert whom he quotes in defense of the Secretary concludes by saying:

When all has been said that can be said, it remains true nevertheless that these repeated changes by one administration after another in the form and character of the debt and Treasury statements are disturbing and highly objectionable, if for no other reason that they render difficult comparisons with the past on an identical basis. The lesson which the experience teaches would seem to be that the character and contents of these statements ought to be prescribed by law so as to render it impossible for each new head of the Treasury Department to impose on the form of the statement his own ideas as to what it should be.

Secretary McAdoo's formal announcement gives as the reason for the changes that they are in order to make the statements "more intelligible and clearer to the public." I think that even the most ardent admirer of the Secretary would scarcely claim that, made as they were made and when they were made, they were either calculated to serve, or did serve, this laudable purpose.

What has been the course of this inflated balance during the last three and a half months? From \$128,000,000 on October 1 it was \$100,541,000 on January 16 last—a loss of \$28,000,000 in three and a half months, or at the rate of \$8,000,000 a month. If the two disputed items—aggregating \$83,000,000—were removed from the balance shown in the January 16 statement, there would remain as our true "net balance" but about \$17,000,000, as compared with the figure of \$145,000,000 on July 1, 1914. Not all this \$17,000,000 is regarded as "available" in the sense that it can be readily used to pay our bills. Small silver and other fractional currency and bullion have always been deducted in determining our available balance. These amounted, on January 16, to \$27,000,000. So far as available funds went we had, with nearly six months of the fiscal year yet to run, an actual deficit in the Treasury of \$10,000,000.

A recent statement of Harvey S. Chase, certified public accountant, who has in the past been employed as an expert by Secretary McAdoo, may be of interest in this connection, although dealing with a date last October, when conditions were materially better than on January 16:

On August 4, 1913, the "free available balance" in the Treasury office and in banks was \$106,793,571.44. This I know to be correct, as I was at work in the United States Treasury at that time, and the form of statement from July 1, 1913, to August 4, and for some time later, was prepared under my personal supervision. "Subsidiary silver coin," "silver bullion," and "minor coin" were not included in the balance of one hundred and six millions, as stated above. I have compared the statement of August 4, 1913, with the statement of October 23, 1915, in which \$30,472,159.60 of "subsidiary silver coin," "silver bullion," and "minor coin" are included in the balance. This amount should properly be deducted from the stated balance.

On August 4, 1913, disbursing officers' balances, amounting to \$69,817,050.50, were included among the liabilities and the "national bank-notes redemption fund" was also included as a liability. It then amounted to \$20,760,883.50. Both these amounts were included as liabilities at that time and they have been so included up to October 1, 1915, whereas on October 23, 1915, they are excluded, thereby inflating the stated balance.

I therefore certify that if the Daily statement of the United States Treasury of October 23, 1915, had been made up on the same basis as that of August 4, 1913, the available balance in the Treasury would now be exhibited as \$3,517,027.21.

The statement of January 16 shows that the deficit for the six months of the present fiscal year already amounts to over \$60,000,000. Yet we have had an income tax—estimated by its authors to yield \$82,000,000—in fact, yielding the first year \$28,000,000; a war tax, yielding about \$80,000,000 a year; and large imports capable of yielding a fair percentage in customs. We have not even embarked upon our program of national defense, so the deficit can not be charged to the "preparedness" movement.

Nevertheless our Treasury is in a bad way—practically bankrupt, indeed, as we have seen. It is a few dollars ahead of zero one day, a few dollars behind zero the next. Can it be said that Mr. UNDERWOOD's promise that his law would yield ample revenue has been realized?

But it is important to know why the virtual bankruptcy has come about. There are two ways by which a party can play ducks and drakes with the finances of the country: First, by decreasing the revenues, and second, by rolling up the expenses.

We have seen, perhaps at sufficient length, just how and to what extent the Democratic tariff has reduced revenues in spite of the fact that imports were, during the war, of about normal Republican volume.

But how about our expenditures? The Democratic Party came into power on a platform pledging it to strict economy. Yet the Congress which died—unwep, unhonored, and unsung—last March appropriated \$177,000,000 more than any Republican Congress in history. This is ancient history. I do not care

to spend much time on it. I should, however, like to quote the words of that able Democrat, the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations [Mr. FITZGERALD]:

[CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 63d Cong., 2d sess., pp. 6553-6554, Apr. 10, 1914.]

In a few months I shall be called upon in the discharge of my official duties to review the record that this Democratic House shall have made in its authorization of the expenditure of the public moneys. Whenever I think of the horrible mess that I shall be called upon to present to the country on behalf of the Democratic Party I am tempted to quit my place.

If I placed my political fortunes above my sworn duty under the law, I would not attempt to carry out the promises of the Democratic platform, but I should place myself at the head of this band of Treasury looters upon every occasion.

They have unnecessarily piled up the public expenditures until the Democratic Party is becoming the laughing stock of the country.

And also the forceful statement of his colleague on that committee [Mr. Sisson]:

[CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 63d Cong., 2d sess., pp. 6209-6210, Apr. 3, 1914.]

We are writing ourselves down in the history of the country as being the most outrageously and the most criminally extravagant Congress that ever sat on the American Continent. I said this in a speech before, in the last session, and when I made that speech Members of the Democratic House came to me and asked me not to put it in the RECORD, because it would be used by the Republicans in their campaign book. Let them use it.

You may use that statement now, gentlemen, because when Democrats get to be so violently extravagant that it makes our record look bad as compared to the very wicked record of the Republicans I must apologize to you Republicans for having ever used the words "criminally extravagant" in criticizing the appropriations that you made, for if that expression, "criminally extravagant" was proper to apply to you, my God, the English language has never found an adjective strong enough to apply to Democratic extravagance.

It is, then, because of the combination of reduced revenue, as a result of the application of low-tariff theories, and grossly inflated expenditures that the Treasury finds itself in the worst financial plight since the Civil War.

Extraordinary taxes will be levied, no doubt, more and more, to meet the legitimate increases of Army and Navy. Sound financing of the program would require simply the elimination of all useless extravagances and the resumption of a fair duty on imports. If we do these two things, we need not continue our vexatious war tax, and yet we shall have ample funds to put into effect any reasonable preparedness program.

What do the estimates furnished at the convening of this Congress indicate as to the expenditure policy of the administration for the ensuing fiscal year? The Army and Navy estimates naturally and properly show a very large increase over last year's corresponding estimates. With this I have no fault to find. But the striking and saddening feature of the situation is that the estimate of every department of the Government shows a decided increase over that submitted to Congress in December, 1914, in spite of the fact that those estimates were at the time the largest in our history. The administration thus indicates, by recommending increases aggregating some \$45,000,000 outside the preparedness items, no disposition whatever to curtail the ordinary "household" expenses of the Government, but, on the contrary, an apparent determination to plunge us still deeper into the financial quagmire. With a bankrupt Treasury, with customs revenues averaging only 10 per cent on imports, the Democratic Party shows no intention, no desire even, "to cut the garment to the cloth," but, instead, is determined to rush headlong into wilder and more desperate extravagances.

I am proud to number among my most valued friends very many members of the Democratic Party both within and without the House of Representatives. I accord to them the highest virtue, sincerity, and patriotism; nevertheless, I believe that certain of their economic doctrines are fundamentally mistaken and pregnant with danger for the Nation. In saying this I think I am not blinded by partisan bias; indeed, I am not stating my belief as strongly as do certain eminent Democrats holding high public office, some of whom I have already quoted in the course of my remarks. Let me quote from another and very recent speech of a distinguished and patriotic Democrat, Senator NEWLANDS, of Nevada. Much of what I have said to-day might be regarded as almost a paraphrase of his remarks. Speaking in the Senate on January 11 (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 921) he said, in part:

Since the commencement of the Civil War, a period of 65 years, the Democratic Party has been in power nationally only 11 years, and of that period only 4 years consecutively, in every instance losing power as the result of the fear or the resentment of the business classes with their accompanying conditions of unemployment, which made most potent with the workingman "the full-dinner-pail" argument and caused them to reluctantly yield to the persuasion and coercion of our opponents.

We were in similar danger at the congressional election of 1914, a danger only averted by the European war.

The realization that similar prudence would keep us out of European complications saved the Democratic Party at the last election from the defeat which would have surely come as the result of the general prostration of business, popularly attributed to our economic legislation.

An industrial and commercial depression has been experienced and has been coterminous with Democratic control of legislation. It would not do to charge this to the European war, first, because that war, though injurious to our production and trade in its inception, has since become a stimulant to production and export, and, second, because the commencement of this depression antedates the European war and was contemporaneous with our legislation regarding the tariff, banking, and trade.

The recent elections indicate that we will be in similar danger at the coming presidential election, unless the European war continues, and makes the President's sagacious and firm handling of our foreign affairs the overshadowing issue. But if that war soon comes to a close, and the manufacture of munitions ends, and added to this source of unemployment our markets now protected by the war from invasion are overwhelmed by the cheap products of the nations just emerging from war and eager to get back their gold, we may have not only an aggravated industrial depression to meet, but a financial condition fruitful of paralyzing caution. Such conditions may make the election turn not upon our foreign policy but upon domestic economic conditions, and the "full-dinner-pail" argument may again be potential.

It is safe to say that the manufacturing, the banking, and the large corporate interests are hostile to the Democratic Party, and that their employees are also preparing to throw their weight against it simply because its administration has not brought good times, but on the contrary has, in their judgment, brought bad times.

Regarding the tariff my general view was that the reduction on dutiable articles from an average of over 42 per cent to an average of less than 25 per cent was too great, taking away possibly the entire margin of profit and even more.

The effect of the tariff legislation was what I feared it would be.

While I accept my full share of responsibility for the tariff bill, which I with apprehension of immediate ill effect voted for, and nor will I permit me to assert, as many of its supporters do, that world-wide causes were at the bottom of the general contraction of production following its agitation and passage. It is an indisputable fact that the paralysis came before the European war was inaugurated, and that its causes were mainly domestic.

Upon all the evidence, therefore, I am convinced that the rule of the Democratic Party in national affairs is disastrous to the country as a whole, and especially disastrous to a State like Massachusetts, which, in part, I have the honor to represent on this floor. I base this assertion upon two broad grounds:

First. Because its tariff policy is suicidal for any industrial population. Take the actual words of the Democratic platform of 1912:

We declare it to be a fundamental principle of the Democratic Party that the Federal Government, under the Constitution, has no right or power to impose or collect tariff duties except for the purpose of revenue.

In other words, its historic economic theory, again promulgated in 1912, is that revenue, and not reasonable protection, should be the keynote of tariff making; that the European manufacturer should be actually encouraged to send to our markets the products of his mills and factories. Let me show by two recent illustrations what I mean. Secretary Redfield, as head of the Department of Commerce, is charged with the supervision of our foreign and domestic trade policy. In an official bulletin, sent out last autumn under the Government frank to practically every important newspaper in the United States, he says:

The Swiss legation at Washington has advices from Berne that manufacturers in Switzerland are anxious to supply the Christmas toy trade of the United States, and the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, of the Department of Commerce, has undertaken to assist in having orders placed. Some Swiss firms alone have produced hundreds of new models in wood and pasteboard and more are being added daily. A few of these samples which have reached Washington are skillfully executed lithograph soldiers of all the belligerent nations for the construction of little armies by American children.

Toy making is a considerable and a growing industry in the United States. The last census gives us the following statistics concerning it:

Toys and games.
[Census of 1909.]

	Massachusetts.	United States.
Number of establishments.....	16	226
Total employed.....	1,143	5,305
Capital.....	\$1,103,596
Total expenses.....	\$1,564,503
Wages.....	\$446,792
Value of product.....	\$1,750,739	\$8,264,135
Value added by manufacturing.....	\$892,165	\$4,709,897

New York, Massachusetts, and Pennsylvania are the leading States in the industry, dividing over one-half the total production.

While, of course, not one of our great industries, it gives employment already to over 5,000 men. It requires no great experience, technical knowledge, or capital to make Teddy bears, rag dolls, or games. The industry is capable of being made

one of the most productive and desirable in the country. Yet, in anticipation of the Christmas season, Secretary Redfield deliberately and officially states that the Swiss manufacturers—quite naturally—are “anxious to supply the Christmas toy trade of the United States,” and that, in view of this, his department “has undertaken to assist in having orders placed.” Can you imagine this occurrence under a Republican administration? And if you can, can you conceive that a Republican Secretary would boast of it? The Republican view is that our home industries should be protected, if they need such protection, and to the extent of their need, against foreign manufacturers, whether in Switzerland, Germany, Great Britain, China, or Japan.

Take another brilliant bit of advertising by Secretary Redfield. In Commerce Reports dated November 4, 1915, it is said, presumably with his approval:

Two visitors from Russia have nearly completed the organization of a cooperative sales agency for promoting Russian interests. Their efforts were materially assisted by the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce.

Here it is “Russian interests” Secretary Redfield has “materially assisted,” but the principle is the same as in the Swiss case. I submit that it is not a safe or sound policy for the American people.

Second. Democratic rule in national affairs is bad for an industrial State like Massachusetts, because the Democracy in Congress is dominated by the South and because the point of view of its leaders seems antagonistic to the even reasonable welfare of a manufacturing and mercantile population. I do not make this statement lightly or in any desire to stir up sectional disaffection. I make it on the authority of public utterances of the leaders themselves. By way of illustration, let me quote the familiar threat of the present majority leader, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KITCHIN]:

[CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 62d Cong., vol. 47, pt. 1, p. 279.]

We in the South intend to make the New England mills come down and put their mills there or else go out of business. [Applause.]

And also the more recent and very enlightening remark by Mr. KITCHIN's unsuccessful rival for the majority leadership, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GARNER], who is so influential on the Ways and Means Committee:

[Quoted from Boston Herald.]

We Democrats are in charge of the House, and I'll tell you right now every time one of those Yankees gets a ham I'm going to do my best to get a hog.

Doubtless we should all agree that it is desirable and wholesome to have two strong and fairly evenly balanced political parties in national affairs, each vigilant to protect the country as a whole from the mistakes or excesses of the other and each entirely national and nonsectional in scope and attitude. It is unfortunate that throughout the southern section of the country there is really no minority party, and that the Democratic Party reigns supreme. This situation tends to give rise to the point of view which I have just illustrated by quotations from two southern Democratic leaders. It is further illustrated by a statement of the present Attorney General of the United States, T. W. Gregory, of Texas:

The brutality and senselessness of the great wrong of reconstruction can not be forgiven or forgotten. It welded every element of the South into eternal opposition to a political party; it made adherence to that party moral, social, and political treason; it made it impossible for us to divide on any issues of expediency, or even of right and wrong; and, to sum it all up, it made it impossible for a southern born and bred man to vote the Republican ticket and go home and face his wife and children.

I have made a much longer speech than I had intended. Perhaps it could all have been said in a sentence. Again I quote from an eminent Democratic source, Senator JOHN SHARP WILLIAMS, of Mississippi, the former leader of his party in this body: [CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 63d Cong., 2d sess., p. 6381, Apr. 8, 1914.]

The poor, dear, old foolish Democratic Party is going through the same game that she can be generally trusted to go through with soon after she gets into power.

That is the Democratic Party; that is its history; that is what led old Tom Reed to say in 1894 and 1895:

“You can not last long, because you are not accustomed to governing anybody or anything; you can not govern the country; you can not even govern yourselves; you are incompetent.”

[Applause.]

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I will ask the Clerk to read the bill under the five-minute rule.

The bill was read.

The committee amendment was read, as follows:

That the appointment of the nine delegates by the Secretary of the Treasury to represent the United States in the proceedings of the International High Commission to be held in Buenos Aires, Argentina, during the year 1916, in accordance with the action of the First Pan American Financial Conference, held in Washington during the year 1915, pursuant to the provisions of an act of Congress approved March 4, 1915, entitled “An act making appropriations for the Diplomatic and Consular Service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916,” be, and the same is hereby approved and confirmed; such delegates shall be known as the United States section of the International High Commission and shall cooperate with other sections of the commission in taking action upon the recommendations of the First Pan American Financial Conference; and the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to fill any vacancies that may occur in the United States section of said international commission.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment to the amendment: Strike out the words “Secretary of the Treasury” and insert the word “President” in line 17, page 2, of the committee amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 17, amend the committee amendment by striking out the words “Secretary of the Treasury” and insert in lieu thereof the word “President.”

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise and report the bill as amended to the House with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. RUSSELL of Missouri, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 8235, and had directed him to report the same with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The SPEAKER. Is there a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them in gross.

The question was taken, and the amendments were agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. FLOOD, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

IMPEACHMENT OF H. SNOWDEN MARSHALL.

Mr. WEBB. Mr. Speaker, I desire to offer the following privileged resolution.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Carolina offers a privileged resolution, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 110.

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary in continuing their consideration of House resolution 90 be authorized and empowered to send for persons and papers, to subpoena witnesses, to administer oaths to such witnesses, and take their testimony.

The said committee is also authorized to appoint a subcommittee to act for and on behalf of the whole committee wherever it may be deemed advisable to take testimony for said committee. In case such subcommittee is appointed it shall have the same powers in respect to obtaining testimony as are herein given to the Committee on the Judiciary, with a sergeant at arms, by himself or deputy, who shall attend the sittings of such subcommittee and serve the process of same.

In case the Committee on the Judiciary or a subcommittee thereof deems it necessary it may employ such clerks and stenographers as are required to carry out the authority given in this resolution, and the expenses so incurred shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House.

The Speaker of the House of Representatives shall have authority to sign, and the Clerk thereof to attest, subpoenas for witnesses, and the Sergeant at Arms or a deputy shall serve them.

Mr. WEBB. Mr. Speaker—

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Tennessee rise?

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I would not wish this resolution to go through as a privileged resolution. I am in favor of the resolution, but I do not desire it to go through as privileged, and I suggest to the gentleman that he ask unanimous consent.

Mr. WEBB. If the Speaker does not think it is privileged, of course, I will ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

Mr. GARRETT. I am not even making a point of order, but merely suggesting this to the gentleman from North Carolina.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Carolina asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution just read. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. WEBB. Mr. Speaker, I want to say to the House that the Committee on the Judiciary has had under consideration House resolution No. 90, which was referred to that committee probably some 10 days ago. The committee has not come to any conclusion yet on the resolution, but feels that it should ask the House for the authority to subpoena some witnesses before it that might throw some light upon the charges made. The resolution was unanimously adopted by the Committee on the Judiciary to-day, and I trust that it may pass and that the committee may secure the authority, which it will immediately exercise.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The question was taken, and the resolution was agreed to.

ADDITIONAL PAGE.

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. HUMPHREYS] asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 111.

Resolved, That the Doorkeeper be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to appoint an additional page for the remainder of the present session, to be paid for out of the contingent fund of the House, at a salary of \$75 per month.

Mr. MANN. Reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain what is intended by this?

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. The purpose of this resolution is this: One of our colleagues, as we know, suffers under the terrible misfortune of being blind, and it is the purpose of this resolution to create this additional page, who will be assigned to him to go with him to and from his office and about the Capitol here, in order to aid him in attending to his public duties. There are not sufficient pages on the roll now to have one of them detailed for his exclusive use, and this resolution is intended to serve that particular purpose.

Mr. MANN. If the gentleman will permit, when the session commenced I asked the Doorkeeper to furnish a page to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. SCHALL] in the House whenever it was desired, and that has been done. But it does not answer the necessity. I quite agree with the gentleman from Mississippi that it would be very proper for the House to provide the additional page for the gentleman from Minnesota.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The question was taken, and the resolution was agreed to.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 33 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until Friday, January 28, 1916, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of a communication of the Secretary of the Navy of the 25th instant, submitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation amending his estimate on page 77 of the Annual Book of Estimates for the fiscal year of 1917, under the title "Salaries, office of the Secretary of the Navy" (H. Doc. No. 623); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

2. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of a communication from the Secretary of the Navy, submitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation in the sum of \$32,475 required under the Naval Establishment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1917, for improving the water supply at the naval training station, San Francisco, Cal. (H. Doc. No. 624); to the Committee on Naval Affairs and ordered to be printed.

3. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, reports on preliminary examination and survey of New York Harbor, N. Y., between Staten Island and Hoffman Island (H. Doc. No. 625); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

4. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, reports on preliminary ex-

amination and survey of harbor at Green Bay, Wis., with a view to securing a channel depth of 21 feet (H. Doc. No. 626); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed, with illustration.

5. A letter from the president of Washington & Old Dominion Railway, submitting report of the Washington & Old Dominion Railway for the 12 months ending December 31, 1915 (H. Doc. No. 627); to the Committee on the District of Columbia and ordered to be printed.

6. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report on preliminary examination of Hatchee River, Tenn. (H. Doc. No. 628); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

7. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report on preliminary examination of East Branch of the Yantic River, Conn., from its junction with the Thames River to some point about 2,500 feet northerly to provide a channel of 14 feet in depth, to include this part of the Yantic River in the Thames River project, and to provide for the closing of the West Branch of the Yantic River (H. Doc. No. 629); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 8810) to amend an act relating to the Public Utilities Commission of the District of Columbia, approved March 4, 1913, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 80), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 9) to authorize the closing of part of Forty-first Street NW., in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 81), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. CARAWAY, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 61) to amend section 260 of the Judicial Code, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 82), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, the Committee on Pensions was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2965) granting a pension to Louis J. Shepard, and the same was referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. WILSON of Florida: A bill (H. R. 10222) releasing the claim of the United States Government to that portion of land, being a fractional block, bounded on the north and east by Bayou Cadet, on the west by Cevallos Street, and on the south by Intendencia Street, in the old city of Pensacola, Fla.; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10223) releasing the claim of the United States Government to lot No. 306, in the old city of Pensacola, Fla.; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. PRATT: A bill (H. R. 10224) to provide for the erection of a public building at Bath, N. Y.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. LLOYD (by request): A bill (H. R. 10225) to establish a national flexible currency; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. CLARK of Florida: A bill (H. R. 10226) to repeal all civil-service laws in so far as they apply to the office of Supervising Architect of the Treasury and employees thereof; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10227) to fix the period of residence in the United States necessary to entitle one of foreign birth to the rights of American citizenship; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 10228) providing for the erection of a suitable memorial to John Fitch; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. LITTEPAGE: A bill (H. R. 10229) to provide for purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Webster Springs, W. Va.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. MURRAY: A bill (H. R. 10230) conferring jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment in claims of the Iowa tribe of Indians against the United States; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. DRISCOLL: A bill (H. R. 10231) to amend sections 21 and 31 of the act entitled "An act to amend and consolidate the acts respecting copyright" approved March 4, 1909; to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. KINCHELOE: A bill (H. R. 10232) appropriating \$50,000 to improve the Ohio River, build and construct a levee at Uniontown, Ky.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. SUMNERS: A bill (H. R. 10233) for the establishment of an arsenal and munition-manufacturing plant at Dallas, Tex., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. HERNANDEZ: A bill (H. R. 10234) authorizing the State of New Mexico to convey to the United States lands in the national forests in said State and select other lands therefor; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10235) for the construction of a permanent highway across the Mescalero Indian Reservation in New Mexico, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. SHALLENBERGER: A bill (H. R. 10236) to authorize national banking associations to avail themselves of State laws providing for the guaranteeing of deposits; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10237) requiring railroads engaged in interstate traffic to move freight trains carrying live stock at a certain speed as a minimum; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HAUGEN: A bill (H. R. 10238) granting the consent of Congress to Interstate Bridge Co. to construct a bridge across Mississippi River; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CARAWAY: A bill (H. R. 10239) to aid in the protection of the banks of White River at three points in the State of Arkansas; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. STEPHENS of Nebraska: A bill (H. R. 10240) prohibiting the clearance or entry of United States or foreign ships at any port of the United States when citizens of the United States are carried as passengers on ships whose cargo consists wholly or in part of contraband of war; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. KREIDER: A bill (H. R. 10241) for the relief of certain officers of the Army and Navy in connection with the construction of the Panama Canal; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RAKER: A bill (H. R. 10242) to readjust railway mail pay based on an annual weighing of mail and on space occupied in mail apartment cars, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. FOCHT: A bill (H. R. 10243) extending the benefits of the general pension laws to the members of the Eighth, Twentieth, Twenty-sixth, Twenty-seventh, Twenty-eighth, Twenty-ninth, Thirtieth, Thirty-first, Thirty-second, and Thirty-third Regiments, the several batteries of Artillery, the several troops of Cavalry, and the several independent companies which comprised the Pennsylvania Volunteer Militia, otherwise known as the "emergency men," who were called into service by the President of the United States of America, officered by United States officers, and sworn into the service of the United States for an indefinite period, the same as if they had been in the service of the United States for a period of 90 days or more; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KALANIANAOLE: A bill (H. R. 10244) to amend an act entitled "An act to codify, revise, and amend the laws relating to the judiciary," approved March 3, 1911; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TILSON: A bill (H. R. 10245) to provide for special tools and fixtures necessary for the immediate manufacture of arms, ammunition, and equipment in time of war; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. TIMBERLAKE: A bill (H. R. 10246) authorizing the addition of certain lands to the Colorado National Forest, Colo.; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. McLEMORE: Resolution (H. Res. 100) that the settlement of the Mexican question be left to those States of the Union that are contiguous to Mexico; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. IGOE (by request): Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 120) in reference to the employment of enlisted men in competition with local civilians; to the Committee on Labor.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALLEN: A bill (H. R. 10247) granting a pension to Sarah L. Sheaff; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BEALES (by request): A bill (H. R. 10248) to correct the military record of Charles P. Kibler; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BORLAND: A bill (H. R. 10249) for the relief of Blue Springs (Mo.) Baptist Church; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. CANNON: A bill (H. R. 10250) for the relief of Thomas Aurand; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. CARAWAY: A bill (H. R. 10251) authorizing the Kansas City & Memphis Railway & Bridge Co. to make settlement with Crittenden County, Ark., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CARY: A bill (H. R. 10252) granting an increase of pension to Frank Kubacki; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CASEY: A bill (H. R. 10253) granting a pension to Rebecca Eldridge; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10254) granting a pension to Sophia Freeby; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. COPLEY: A bill (H. R. 10255) for the relief of David Kirch; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10256) for the relief of B. F. Pearsall; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CULLOP: A bill (H. R. 10257) to correct the military record of John W. Parsons; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DAVENPORT: A bill (H. R. 10258) granting an increase of pension to H. Veatch; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10259) granting an increase of pension to John F. Brittain; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10260) granting an increase of pension to Alonzo O. Cody; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10261) granting a pension to John W. Harmon; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DOUGHTON: A bill (H. R. 10262) for the relief of the estate of James H. Newland; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10263) for the relief of the estate of Joel W. Dyer; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. FARR: A bill (H. R. 10264) granting a pension to Hayden E. Evans; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FOSTER: A bill (H. R. 10265) granting an increase of pension to Robert E. Benson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GANDY: A bill (H. R. 10266) granting a pension to Gertrude Hunter; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10267) granting a pension to Abraham M. Reams; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GOODWIN of Arkansas: A bill (H. R. 10268) granting an increase of pension to John R. Greenwood; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GREEN of Iowa: A bill (H. R. 10269) granting a pension to John Weigart; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GUERNSEY: A bill (H. R. 10270) granting a pension to Mary Miller; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HERNANDEZ: A bill (H. R. 10271) to correct the military record of Juan Epomoseno Espinosa; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 10272) granting a pension to Dora Hoffman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10273) granting an increase of pension to Joseph M. Ferguson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KEY of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 10274) granting an increase of pension to Norman Messenger; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LANGLEY: A bill (H. R. 10275) for the allowance of certain soldiers' claims growing out of service in the Army, reported by the Court of Claims, known as three months' pay claims; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. LEVER: A bill (H. R. 10276) granting an increase of pension to Samuel B. McPheeters; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LINTHICUM: A bill (H. R. 10277) to authorize the President to appoint Col. L. Mervin Maus to the grade of brigadier general in the United States Army and place him on the retired list; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LITTLEPAGE: A bill (H. R. 10278) granting an increase of pension to Isaac R. Nichols; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LOUD: A bill (H. R. 10279) granting a pension to Emma Sheldon Jones; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MCCLINTIC: A bill (H. R. 10280) granting an increase of pension to Columbus W. Dennell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MCKENZIE: A bill (H. R. 10281) granting a pension to Mary E. Ruble; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PRATT: A bill (H. R. 10282) granting an increase of pension to John Brown; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. REAVIS: A bill (H. R. 10283) granting an increase of pension to Joseph C. Yutzky; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. REILLY: A bill (H. R. 10284) granting an increase of pension to Eliza Crippen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RIORDAN: A bill (H. R. 10285) for the relief of the Ninth Avenue Railroad Co., of the city of New York, N. Y.; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10286) for the relief of the Sixth Avenue Railroad Co., of New York City, N. Y.; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10287) for the relief of the Twenty-third Street Railway Co., of the city of New York, N. Y.; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10288) for the relief of the Forty-second Street and Grand Street Ferry Railroad Co., of New York City, N. Y.; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10289) for the relief of the Broadway and Seventh Avenue Railroad Co., of New York City, N. Y.; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10290) for the relief of the Eighth Avenue Railroad Co., of New York City, N. Y.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. RUSSELL of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 10291) granting a pension to Emma B. Mitchell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH of Minnesota: A bill (H. R. 10292) granting an increase of pension to Eleanor Stahler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10293) granting an increase of pension to Anne E. Nolan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SWEET: A bill (H. R. 10294) granting an increase of pension to John B. Kerr; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10295) granting an increase of pension to Minerva Lavine; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. VARE: A bill (H. R. 10296) to correct the lineal and relative rank of Capt. Thomas J. Leary, Medical Corps, United States Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WHEELER: A bill (H. R. 10297) granting an increase of pension to William Mullen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 10298) for the relief of John W. Walsh; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WILSON of Florida: A bill (H. R. 10299) for the relief of the estate of John G. Smith; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WINGO: A bill (H. R. 10300) granting a pension to George W. Oblisk; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WOOD of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 10301) granting a pension to Martha J. Shallenberger; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10302) granting a pension to George F. Harter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. ASHBROOK: Evidence to accompany House bill 9629, for the relief of Susan K. Nash; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, evidence to accompany House bill 8052, for the relief of John Toothman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, evidence to accompany House bill 6988, for the relief of William C. Johnson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BEALES: Petition of citizens of Hanover, Pa., and O'Neil Silk Co., favoring tax on dyestuffs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Philadelphia Wholesale Lumber Dealers' Association and Southern Transportation Co., of Philadelphia, Pa., favoring passage of the Small bill, regulating compulsory

pilotages on barges; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BRUCKNER: Petition of Henry Street Settlement, New York, favoring passage of the child-labor bill; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition of Buffalo Chamber of Commerce, relative to survey of the entrance to Buffalo River; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, petition of Central Merchants' Association and New York Board of Trade and Transportation, relative to curtailment of mail deliveries in New York City; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of John Kraemer, of Springfield, Mass., protesting against Federal censorship of motion pictures; to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. GARY: Memorial of port cities of Lake Michigan and Green Bay against the continued diversion of the waters of Lake Michigan into the Sanitary Drainage Canal at Chicago; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, memorial of Kenosha County Equal Suffrage League, favoring the Keating-Owen bill; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin: Petition of Hough Shade Corporation, of Janesville, Wis., favoring tax on dyestuffs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CAMPBELL: Petitions of depositors in the banks of Kansas, against revenue stamps on bank checks; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ELSTON: Memorial of Oakland Chamber of Commerce, favoring appropriations for new vessels, etc., in the United States Coast and Geodetic Survey; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. EMERSON: Petitions of grape growers of northern Ohio, against passage of House bill 6036; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ESCH: Petition of Robert Engelke and 21 others of La Crosse, Wis., favoring passage of the Burnett immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. FULLER: Petition of Chicago Federation of Musicians, favoring permanent tariff commission; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH: Memorial of William Suggett and 70 other citizens of Salem, Ohio, in favor of printing report of testimony of Industrial Commission; to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. HOWELL: Petition of Clifton Pierce, of Springville, Utah, against Federal censorship of motion pictures; to the Committee on Education.

Also, memorial of Salt Lake (Utah) Free Kindergarten and Neighborhood Association, favoring child-labor bill; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island: Petition of the Providence (R. I.) Chamber of Commerce, favoring extension of appropriation to continue the purchase of Federal forest reserves in New England and southern Appalachians; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Rhode Island State Branch of American Federation of Labor, favoring passage of House bill 6871, relative to convict labor; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, memorial of New England Shoe and Leather Association, favoring creation of tariff board; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KIESS of Pennsylvania: Petitions of citizens of Coudersport, Pa., against national defense; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LEWIS: Resolutions by Division No. 572, Amalgamated Association of Street and Electric Railway Employees of America, of Frostburg, Md., protesting against the tax on oleomargarine; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania: Memorial of Philadelphia Board of Trade, against passage of Senate bill 3055, relative to appointment of clerks of United States court; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORIN: Petition of Woman's Alliance of First Unitarian Church of Pittsburgh, Pa., favoring passage of the child-labor bill; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition of Henry Gross, of Pittsburgh, Pa., favoring embargo on munitions; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also (by request): Petitions of Henrico Lumber Co., Philadelphia Wholesale Lumber Dealers' Association, and Southern Transportation Co., all of Philadelphia, Pa., favoring passage of bill relative to compulsory pilotage on barges; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. NOLAN: Resolutions of the California Development Board, San Francisco, Cal., favoring remedial legislation in

behalf of the oil industry of the State of California; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, resolutions of the Pacific Fisheries Society, Portland, Oreg., favoring increased appropriations for the United States Bureau of Fisheries; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, protest of the Granite Cutters' International Association of America, against the action of the Treasury Department in prohibiting the use of granite in the construction of public buildings in localities where the postal income is less than \$800,000; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, protest of the Associated Theatrical Managers of San Francisco, Cal., against the continuance of the war-revenue tax as applied to allied theatrical industries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PATTEN: Petition of sundry piano manufacturers of New York City and vicinity, in favor of the Stevens bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PRATT: Memorial of M. D. Foster, Willis Strows, J. M. Williams, D. C. Howell, E. D. Wickham, Mrs. A. E. Arnold, L. Price, Mrs. W. M. Hall, Clinton Neal, R. L. Dodds, Mrs. L. Price, Mrs. George Faulkner, Mrs. A. S. Whalen, Mrs. Willis Strows, Mrs. Belle Dunham, Mrs. James Jennings, Mrs. C. Magee, C. Magee, H. G. Barber, Rev. Z. Evans, A. M. Phelps, Keturah Evans, T. Otis Price, Mrs. A. R. Brown, Gladys Foster, Kathryn Price, Ida Foster, W. K. Mulligan, S. C. Benson, R. W. Neal, L. W. Fink, E. E. Seitz, Charles Bowers, G. A. Kepler, B. A. Hefkins, J. M. Kreider, Charles Leonard, D. C. Howell, G. A. Snyder, David Love, Silas Mead, R. W. Neal, L. S. Bailey, John D. Wilson, F. E. Harris, Tracy Leonard, Esther Houseworth, Christiana A. Sears, Julia M. Kopkie, Howard Howell, Joseph Kopkie, Clarence Matthews, Emmett Weavers, Laurence Riegel, Mrs. A. M. Phelps, Dorothy Magee, Helen De Mun, Freda Kratsley, Hope Williams, Ralph Dean, Harry Cassidy, Claude Sirrini, Osborn Smith, Ralph Wilson, Bernice Dean, H. D. Johnson, W. M. McCoy, Emma Johnson, Ilah Evans, J. M. Dean, Helen Johnson, Mrs. Clara Conover, H. Conover, Mrs. Howard H. Johnson, Mrs. Jessie Kelley, Helen Stilwell, Mrs. Osborn Smith, Mrs. George Case, Maude McCoy, Howard Johnson, and G. J. Case, all of Burdett, N. Y., favoring the passage of the Smith-Hughes bills for the national censorship of moving pictures; to the Committee on Education.

Also, memorial of Claude W. Weaver, Walter Kaubisch, E. I. Kelley, Mark Bernt, William W. Arland, Roger S. McAvoy, H. O. Warns, John Fahey, J. M. Franz, G. J. Seibel, Jacob Aker, Frank Gottfried, W. F. Hilk, Julius Schneider, John J. Illig, Frank Sidoti, H. J. Middagh, Frank Gaiss, Fred Vollgraf, C. E. Githler, John McGannon, Charles Gaiss, T. B. Dowling, Edward Gerber, Joseph Gaiss, James A. Gurnsey, Victor Kschoger, John Henry, R. Sarter, G. T. Miles, Charles Miles, A. Kretschmann, Nicholas Drouard, Arthur Fermer, Nels Person, Isidor Bleichner, J. Peter Nockel, August Stenger, Jules Skwerer, Fred Kinch, John Ward, W. S. Holmes, F. E. Cilley, Carl Johnson, Adrian Krebs, G. A. Mayer, Frank Mayer, George Black, Arthur Rooney, John Cunningham, L. J. Cahill, W. T. Scholz, and John Huonker, all of Corning, N. Y., favoring an embargo upon further shipments of war material; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. RAINEY: Petitions of merchants of the twentieth congressional district of Illinois, favoring a tax on mail-order houses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. REILLY: Petitions of business men of sixth district of Wisconsin, favoring tax on mail-order houses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROWE: Petition of Theatrical Protective Union, New York, relative to tax on theaters; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of public forum, Church of Ascension, New York, favoring child-labor bill; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. SMITH of Michigan: Memorial of Gilbert Lodge, No. 240, Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Engineers, Jackson, Mich., favoring retirement with compensation for Federal employees; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

By Mr. STINESS: Papers to accompany bill (H. R. 10202) granting an increase of pension to Hannah Sweet; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany bill (H. R. 10203) granting an increase of pension to Emily P. Stevens; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SNELL: Petition representing 600 people of the Centenary Methodist Episcopal Church, of Malone, N. Y., for the establishment of a motion-picture commission; to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. TINKHAM: Petition of American Federation of Labor, protesting against repeal of the seamen's law; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. WASON: Petition of Hart & Shepard, Shakers, of East Canterbury, N. H., favoring tax on dyestuffs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WINSLOW: Petition of Peter Wood Dyeing Co., of Worcester, Mass., favoring tax on dyestuffs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE.

FRIDAY, January 28, 1916.

The Chaplain, Rev. Forrest J. Prettyman, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, we have come upon times in our national life and in the world life when we are driven to Thee for aid. An inheritance of honor and manhood makes us unafraid in conflict with men. Death has no alarm to us if it is the price of honor. We fear lest we should stand apart from Thee. Thy will is supreme. Thy law is over all.

We believe that Thou hast given to us a voice and a mission and a power among the nations of the earth. We pray Thee to lay tribute upon these that we may fulfill the Divine plan in us. Guide us this day in the discharge of the duties that are before us. For Christ's sake. Amen.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

ARMY POSTS (S. DOC. NO. 261).

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of War, which will be read.

The Secretary read as follows:

WAR DEPARTMENT,
Washington, January 27, 1916.

HON. JAMES M. BAKER,

Secretary Senate of the United States, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Referring to resolution by the Senate of the 6th instant, that the Secretary of War furnish to the Senate, if not incompatible with the public interests, certain information with reference to Army posts in the United States, I have the honor to transmit herewith detailed information covering the first four items of the information requested. As to the fifth and sixth items, I am not now prepared to make specific recommendations on this subject, as the passage of any of the bills now before Congress looking to an increase in the Military Establishment would probably require the use of all Army posts now available.

Very sincerely,

LINDLEY M. GARRISON,
Secretary of War.

Mr. KENYON. I should like to inquire if this report will be published in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair was just inquiring of the clerks at the desk the Senator who offered the resolution.

Mr. KENYON. I offered the resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair would inquire of the Senator from Iowa what is his desire as to the committee to which it shall be referred?

Mr. KENYON. I ask that it be published in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. And referred to any committee?

Mr. KENYON. I think not.

Mr. SMOOT. Would not the printing of it as a public document do just as well, rather than to have the RECORD cumbered?

Mr. KENYON. I would prefer that, but I thought it might be more economical to publish it in the RECORD. I ask that it be printed as a public document.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the communication and accompanying papers will be printed as a public document, and not in the RECORD.

COMMERCIAL FERTILIZERS AND COTTON PRODUCTION (S. DOC. NO. 262).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, in response to a resolution of the 11th instant, a statement relative to the amount of commercial potash, nitrogen, and phosphoric acid available for fertilizer purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and ordered to be printed.

REPORT OF THE NATIONAL ACADEMY OF SCIENCES.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the annual report of the National Academy of Sciences for the year ended December 31, 1915, which was ordered to lie on the table.

REPORT OF WASHINGTON & OLD DOMINION RAILWAY (H. DOC. NO. 627).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the annual report of the Washington & Old Dominion Railway for the year ended December 31, 1915, which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia and ordered to be printed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by J. C. South, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had passed the bill